



# Imprimatur.

*March 30,  
1691.*

*Z. Isham, R. P. D.  
Hen. Episc. Lond.  
à Sacris.*



# Imprimatur.

*March 30,  
1691.*

*Z. Isham, R. P. D.  
Hen. Episc. Lond.  
à Sacris.*



A N  
**A N S W E R**  
T O A  
**Socinian Treatise,**  
CALL'D,  
**The Naked Gospel,**  
WHICH WAS  
Decreed by the University of *Oxford*,  
in Convocation, *August 19, Anno Dom. 1690.*  
to be Publickly Burnt, as containing divers  
**Heretical Propositions.**

W I T H  
A POSTSCRIPT, in Answer to what is added  
by *Dr. Bury*, in the Edition just Published.

By *THOMAS LONG*, B. D.  
One of the Prebendaries of *St. Peter's Exon.*

*Contra rationem nemo Sobrius, contra Scripturas nemo Christianus, contra Ecclesiam nemo pacificus senserit. August. de Trinitate, l. 4. c. 6.*  
*Sanctius & reverentius visum est de actis Deorum credere quam Scire. Tacitus.*

*London*: Printed by *Freeman Collins*, and are to be Sold  
by *Randal Taylor*, near *Stationers-Hall*. 1691.

A N

ANSWER

TO A

Socialian Treatise

OF

The Paper Gold

Decoded by the University of Oxford  
in a Convention held at the University of Oxford  
in the month of June, 1844, and containing  
the results of the discussion.

Essential Propositions.  
A POSTSCRIPT in answer to what is added  
to the Book in the Edition just published.

BY THOMAS CARPENTAR, ESQ.  
OF THE BARRISTERS AT LAW.

LONDON: Printed by J. W. Smith, at the 'Star and Garter,' St. Paul's Church-yard, 1844.

Price 1s. 6d. per copy, in cloth, and 1s. 3d. in paper.

TO THE  
Right Reverend Father in God,  
**JONATHAN,**  
By Divine Permission, Lord Bishop of **EXON.**

**I** May justly fear, that in the Dedication of these *Exercitationes*, I have done as some inconsiderate Persons, who seek to excuse a less, by committing of a greater Offence: It was, I confess, a great Presumption, that I prefix your Lordship's Name to a *Hasty Scribble* against the *Crime of Persecution* charged on the *Church of England*; and now I presume upon your Lordship's Patience and Patronage in a Case of greater Importance; it is not a *Scandalum Magnatum*, nor any of the Pleas of a Temporal Crown, but a *Crime Laese Majestatis*, an Overt Attempt to overthrow the Crown and Kingdom of our Blessed Saviour; as if he also were a King *de Facto*, and not *de Jure*; which I now lay before your Lordship, it is the Crown and Dignity of him in whose Person and Due Worship and Honour our common Salvation is wrap'd up: The Sanction of our Law, (*viz.*) *de Heretico comburendo*, was, I confess, too severe; but if there be not some Powerful Restraint laid on such Damnable Heresies as *deny the LORD that bought them*, the Sons of *Belial*, will not forbear to deny him on Earth, with a *Non Obstante* to our Saviour's threatening, *Him will I deny before my Father which is in heaven*: The Ecclesiastical Laws are but as *Bruta Fulmina*, to such as wilfully Excommunicate themselves; and unless the Temporal Power supply the Defects of the Spiritual, we are like to run into a worse Confusion than hitherto we have; this sort of Men being as great Enemies to the one as to the other.

*Ruarus* who incurred a Banishment for his *Sacrianism*, though as modest as any of them, in a Tract of Magistracy, printed with his Epistles, p. 461. says, *The times may be such, and if we consider the state of all Ages and Nations, they have been, and still are such, that it is more hard for a Christian to discharge the Office of a Magistrate, especially of a Supreme, than for a rich Man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.* They are for an *Independent Ministry*; no Friends to either  
of

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

of our Lord's Institutions, the Sacraments of *Infant Baptism*, and the *Eucharist*; and though while they are under the Power of the Civil Magistrare, they plead for an enlarged Charity, yet if at any time they get the Sword to hang at their sides, their Cruelty will be much more extensive: This I speak the more positively, because,

First, Their Principles lead them to it; for if the Papists, with whom we agree in the chiefest Articles of Religion, be such implacable Enemies, as to design the utter Extirpation of our Church, how much more will the *Socinians*, who condemn us as Polytheists and Idolators, for worshipping those whom they account meer Creatures, execute their Fury on us?

But 2<sup>ly</sup>, their Practices have abundantly declared their Inveterate Malice, for when one *Arian* Presbyter had drawn *Constantins* to be of his Opinion, I tremble to relate what Havock was made in the Church; and before that time under *Dioclesian*, having gotten the Donatists and other Hereticks to strengthen their Party, they committed more Outrages on the Catholicks than *Dioclesian* himself, though that was the *fluctus Decumanus*, the most impetuous Wave that overflowed the Church: I shall give a brief Account from a Witness above all Exceptions, *Vincent Lirinensis*, Ch. 6. *Contr. Her.* with whom *St. Augustine* agrees, in his Discourses against the *Arians*, Vol. 7. and *Socrates* l. 2. c. 10. l. 4. c. 13. and *Sozomen* l. 3. c. 6. the words of *Vincentius* are these: *Cum prophana ipsa Arrianorum, Novitas velut quædam bellona aut furia Capto prius omnium Imperatore cuncta, deinde Palatii culmina legibus novis subjugasset, nequaquam demceps destitit Univerſa Mittere atque vexare privata & publica sacra, prophanaq; omnia nullum boni & veri genere delictum sed quoscunque collidisset tanquam deloco superiore percutere tunc temeratae conjuges, depopulatæ viduæ prophanatæ Virgines, monasteria demolita desturbata, clerici verberati Lexiæ acti in exilium sacerdotes oppleta sancti ergastula carceres Metalla quorum pars Maxima interdictis urbibus protrusi, atque extorres inter desertâ spleluncas feras saxa, nuditate fame siti affecti, contrite & tæbe facti sunt. Atque hæc omnia nunquid ullam aliam ob causam, nisi utique dum pro celesti dogmate humanæ superstitiones introducuntur, dum bene fundata antiquitas scelerata novitate subruitur, dum superiorum instituta violantur, dum rescinduntur scita patrum dum convelluntur definita Majorum, dum sese intra sacratæ, atque incorruptæ veritatis castissimos limites prophanæ, ac novellæ curiositatis libido non continet.* This one Testimony of so good an Author, is enough to make us abhor the Authors of the *Arian*, and much more of the *Socinian* Heresie, which is more Impious, and guilty of the greater Blasphemy, the more sacrilegious Novelty, and of such intolerable Pride and Contempt of all Mankind but themselves, even while

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

while they are under severe Laws, that I believe, if their Power were equal, it would be as well for our Temporal as Spiritual Condition, to live under the *Roman*, as the *Racovian* Harrows.

The Statute 29 Car. 2. which abrogated that *De Heretico Comburendo*, declares, That it doth not take away or abridge any Jurisdiction of Protestant Archbishops, Bishops, or other Judges of his Majesty's Ecclesiastical Courts, in Causes of Atheism, Blasphemy, Heresie, Schism, or other Damnable Doctrines or Opinions; but they may proceed to punish the same according to the Ecclesiastical Laws, by Excommunication, Deprivation, Degradation, and other Ecclesiastical Censures, not extending to Death. So as before the Act, the Learned Judge *Hales*, in the beginning of his Plea's of the Crown, gives an Account of the manner of Conviction of Hereticks, which he says, is, "First, By the Common Law. (Whereof he gives some Instances.) Secondly, By Archbishops and Bishops in a General Synod. Thirdly, By the Bishop in his Diocess. The Common Law, he says, inflicts no Forfeiture, neither indeed doth the Ecclesiastical, if the Criminal abjure his Opinions, being *pro salute Animæ*, but if he relapsed after Abjuration, he is left in a worse condition. The matter of Heresie was to be judged of by the Canonical Scripture: Or, 2. By what hath been determined by the four General Councils. 3. By any General council according to expresse Scripture. 4. By Parliament, with Assent of the Convocation. What Power your Lordship hath over the Head or Members of *Exeter College*, in case of Heresie, I refer to their Statutes.

What Operation these Methods may effect, I know not, but there needs a speedy Application, where the Gangreen gains so visibly, and may be so mortal: But why talk I thus to so great a Master in our *Israel*, who hath a more perfect knowledge of all those things whereof I speak? Your Lordship hath been a constant and eminent Assertor of the Faith established in the Church of *England*, the Foundation whereof is that of the Ever Blessed Trinity, on which all our Worship, and all our Hopes are built; but ungodly Men have in this too licentious Age, endeavoured with all their Might and Subtily to subvert this Foundation: and that which hath caused this Address to your Lordship, is a holy Indignation, when I considered, that there are more who appear in Print to destroy, than to establish this Foundation, which hath caused me, though the weakest of many Thousands, (that my Zeal may provoke others, that have more Knowledge and Abilities) to sollicite the Cause of the Eternal

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

ternal Son of God, against whom that Outcry in the Gospel is revived, *This is the bear, Come let us kill him, and seize on his inheritance*; which they attempt to do by force of their own Merit, and a Natural Righteousness; making void the Righteousness which is of God by Faith in Christ, who is *Jesus*, *The Lord our righteousness*: He that says of Faith in Christ, as the eternal Son of God, *That it is impertinent to our Lord's design, fruitless to the Contemplator's purpose, and dangerous in respect of Blasphemy, and because we have no sure grounds to go upon*, see p. 29. of the *Naked Gospel*, in 2 Col. He that shall say, that it is made the most mischievous *inculcary* in the *Christian World*, To the Reader, p. 7. of the last Edition. He that shall say of those who altogether deny our Saviour's Deity, and dare not worship him at all, *That he dares not in Charity deny the name of Christians, or hope of Salvation to such*, p. 55. of the last Edition, gives great encouragement to the Infidelity of *Jews and Turks*, and contradicts the Scripture which assures us, That there is no other Name under Heaven given among Men, whereby we must be saved, *Acts* 4. 12. And the pretence of enlarging Charity, is too short a Cloak to cover so much Nakedness; it is not Charity to spare a *Barrabban* and crucifie Christ; it is as much against the Law of the Land, and the Constitutions of the Church, as against the Law of God, to cherish such Vipers: The Act 1<sup>o</sup> *Guilel. & Maria*, made for exempting their Majesties Subjects, dissenting from the *Church of England*, from the Penalties of certain Laws, provided that such as will have benefit by that Act, shall subscribe a Profession of the *Christian Belief*, in these words: **I A. B. profess Faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his Eternal Son, and in the Holy Spirit, one God blessed for evermore.** This is the Faith which I contend for, and for which I beg your Lordships Patronage, who hath already so eminently and successfully appeared in its defence, against that unlimited Toleration which would have destroyed it: He that is now your Client is the Eternal Son of God, to whom as the Author of our Salvation, we were dedicated in our Baptism, and have been taught by the undoubted Oracles of God, *That he is our Creator by whom all things were made that are made*; that God that redeemed his Church with his own proper Blood, neither is there Salvation in any other Name; the true God and Eternal Life, to whose Almighty Protection, and All-sufficient Grace, which are able to save to the utmost, all that come to God by Him, I shall daily recommend your Lordship, and all your Relations and Affairs, as is in Duty bound,

Your Lordship's most humble and obliged Servant,

THO. LONG.



# THE PREFACE.

**M**Aresius in the Preface to the Second Part of his *Hydra Socin.* takes notice of the Printing in England, Anno 1654. The Socinian Catechism of John Beedle, Master of Arts, containing all the Impieties and Blasphemies of Socinus; to which he says was added a Catalogue of Socinian Books; his Twelve Reasons against the Deity of the Holy Ghost, and the Life of Faustus Socinus: and that Learned Man thus complains of it, O the deplorable Condition of England, which having driven out their King, now constrains the King of Kings to be banished, and seems to have no greater value for that Liberty which was purchased by Christ's Blood, than to obtain a License of Hearing, Writing, and Believing what they please. If this were a Scandal to the English Nation in those lawless Times, and gave so great an offence to foreign Divines, How much more will the Offence and Scandal be, when the Gospel shall be sent naked abroad, by the hands of a Doctor of Divinity, and Rector of a Colledge, and one that writes himself a True Son of the Church of England; especially considering, that we have now a Protestant King and Queen, (whom God long preserve) Defenders of the Ancient Catholick Faith, which hath been so long professed in the Church.

It is greatly to be deplored, that the Racovian Catechism is so commonly sold both in Latine and English, as is Crellius also, and Beedle's Catechism, and his Arguments against the Deity of the Holy Ghost. And lately, a Swarm of Pamphlets, like venomous Insects, in all parts of the Land, of Theists, Anti-Trinitarians, Unitarians, Arians, and Socinians, darkning, as much as they may, the Light of the Gospel, and poisoning the People.

Grotius, in his Vindication of the States of Holland, professeth, that he knew not one in all the Assembly of the States, that was not ready to denounce an Anathema, as well to the old Doctrines of Samosatenus, as to the new of Socinus, against the Consubstantial, and unconfused and undivided Trinity; yet at that time, the Heresie of Servetus had taken root and

## The P R E F A C E.

*spread itself secretly among very many, so that he himself, to avoid suspicion of being a Patron to them, thought fit to write his Book of the Satisfaction of Christ; and we have this Expression in his Book, De Pietate Ordinum Holland. Seeing that Heresie is the Poyson of the Church, and is quick in its Operation, and there are certain Degrees of Heresie, one being more hurtful than another, there cannot be found any that is worse than the Heresie of Socinus, at the mentioning whereof all good men do tremble.*

*We have reason to bless God, that in such licentious Times as we have seen in the former Age, when a General Toleration was granted, and all sort of Heresies were impunely permitted, and Orthodox Doctrines discountenanced, there are so few persons infected with Heresie, and so many learned persons left us to vindicate the Truths of the Gospel; yet are there some Thousands infected with Anabaptism, and Quakerism, among whom the Pelagian and Socinian Doctrines have got the Ascendant. They talked formerly of being Goddied with God, and Christed with Christ; and now they deny the Godhead of Christ; and Man it with Man: what number of such Hereticks are now among us, the Author of the NAKED GO-SPEL may know better than others; doubtless he presumes of a large Muster, otherwise he would not appear as a Leader to head them; but that he should appear under the Notion of a Son of the Church of England, is the greatest Affront that could be done it; for as Plutarch says, he had rather Men should say, there was never such a Man as Plutarch, than that they should say he was a Vicious Person: So is it a less reproach for the Papists to say, there never was such a Church as the Church of England, than to say it is a Church professing Pelagian and Socinian Doctrines. The Fathers and Sons of our Church, have not, and by the Grace of God will not be wanting in their Duty to Assert her Doctrines, and to Silence all her Adversaries.*

*The University of Oxford have manifested their Abhorrence of it, in Condemning the Book to the Fire: And the Right Reverend the Bishop of Exeter, Visitor of that Colledge, whereof the Author was Rector, hath (as the Statutes of the Colledge directed him in Case of Heresie) very seasonably reprimanded him, whereby it is hoped the Gangreen of his Heresies will be mortified and cut off from infecting the Members of that Famous Colledge. Nor do I doubt but all that have any Authority in Causes Ecclesiastical, will shew the like Detestation of that Damnable Heresie, that denieth the Lord that bought them. The Ancient Fathers were very severe against such; Ignatius, mentioning that passage in Jer. 17. Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, saith, that they are under the Curse, that affirm Christ to be a meer man. Origen, on Job, l. 1. c. 4. Whatever men shall do without Faith in the Holy Trinity, they do in vain, and shall*



## THE P R E F A C E

shall have no reward. *Fulgentius de fide*, p. 9. saith, he cannot be a Christian, that shall not confess the Lord Christ to be his God. *The Fathers have said as much concerning the Arians, that they were Antichristians rather than Christians.*

*Yea, they say the like of Arius as of Julian, That they were both guilty of the Sin against the Holy Ghost; and if to the rest of our National Sins, we should add this, to suffer the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity to be thus publicly derided, and made the Subject of profane Pamphlets; that the Writers should confidently own them, and falsely profess themselves Sons of the Church of England; that there should be a Secret Press still in Labour to be delivered of such Monsters; that there should be a Club to Foster them, and such Heffors to defend and support them, and so many to applaud them; and such Books as were long since written in Latin, are taught to speak English and French; and our English Books in requital, are taught to speak Latin and French Arrianism, is one of the great Provocations for which the Lord's hand is not withdrawn, but is still stretched out to be avenged on us.*

*Luther on his Death-bed, was wont to exhort those who came to visit him, Oremus pro Domino, nostro & ejus Evangelio: Let us pray for our Lord, and for his Gospel. The Gospel was then reviving, and gaining its liberty, it is now imprisoned in all Countries where Popery doth prevail, and it is like to be stript Naked at home, if some charitable Hand doth not seasonably prevent it; to which, that Doom which our Saviour hath denounced, Mat. 25. 43. Go ye cursed; for I was naked, and ye clothed me not, should excite every good Christian; otherwise we may justly fear, that for all the Affronts and Indignities which the Prophane on the one hand, and the Hereticks and Blasphemers on the other hand, between whom our blessed Saviour is crucified afresh, and put to open shame, he deal with us, as he did with the Church of Ephesus, Rev. 2. 5. I will come unto thee quickly, and remove thy Candlestick; except thou repent. And the great haste which so many do make to banish the true knowledge of God out of the Land, is a fearful Prognostick, that our Saviour will come quickly, to be avenged on such a People.*

*My present Undertaking is only to do the Office of a Watch-man, or Sentinel, to discover the approach of an Adversary, and to sound an Alarm to such as are better furnished with Arms and Abilities to vanquish them, of which by the Blessing of God, our Church is provided with many thousands, who, I doubt not, will fight it out, Utq; ad Triarios: If I have for the sake of my Country-men, collected a few Arguments against the Socinian Tenets, it is what the Discourse of the Author led me to; my intent was to discover the dangerous Design of the Naked Gospel, which the Author pretends was for the enlarging of Charity, and for condemning of Impositions in Matters of Faith, under which Notion he industriously condemns those Do-*

## The P R E F A C E.

*Doctrines of the Nicene Fathers, and of Athanasius, which have been received in the Church of England, not only from them, but from the most Primitive Times : But the Doctor says, We have no firm ground to go upon ; not from Scripture, because the Arrians capt Scripture with the Orthodox ; nor from Antiquity, which they claimed with the same confidence ; nor from Councils, which determined sometimes on one side, and sometimes on the other. p. 37. c. 1. Yet he grants, that the Catholics have the advantage of long possession, and that after Sentence ; and at last leaves both the Arrian and Athanasian Doctrines on the same level with Roman Impositions, equally unworthy of our Faith or Study. By this, and what I shall further urge from the Naked Gospel, it will evidently appear, that if the Doctor be of any Religion, that names the Name of Christ, he must be a Socinian.*

*As to the Author's design, he pretends it to be, 1. For the enlarging of Charity ; (i. e.) for a Toleration of his Opinions.*

*2. To prevent Impositions in Matters of Faith, to both which I have replied, and shewn, that the real design is to ridicule the Athanasian Creed, and the Council of Nice, and to prefer a Natural Religion, above that which is taught by them, which he accounts among his unreasonable Impositions ; as having 1. No footing in Scripture ; in answer whereto, I have shewn the Harmony of the Old and New Testament, in Confirmation of those Doctrines. 2. Whereas he says, they have no Foundation in the Fathers, I have produced their Authorities. And thirdly, as for the Councils, Because the Socinians decline their Authority, I have but briefly toucht them. As to my Method, having first considered his Preface, in the next place I have considered his Apology. 3. I have made some general Reflections on the Book ; and lastly, I have discovered what Socinian Doctrines are covertly delivered in each Chapter ; for I find his Oracles, like those of old, to carry a doubtful or double Sense, to be as a Reserve and Refuge, that being driven from the one, he might flye to the other ; and indeed it is more difficult to discover and draw him forth from those Ambushes wherein he lies in wait to deceive, than to baffle his greatest Strength in a plain and open Field ; the first is my chief endeavour, though I have not on occasion declined the other : what I have attempted was not in confidence of my own Abilities, having never been exercised in this stony Controversie, and being now by Age, Miles emeritus ; but only to excite and provoke others to contend for the common Salvation in the Faith once delivered to the Saints ; and whatever the success be, I hope I shall obtain the Pardon of all good Men, seeing I have according to my power cast in my Mite into the Church's Treasury.*

AN  
ANSWER  
To a Late  
TREATISE,  
ENTITLED,  
**The Naked Gospel.**

**T**HE Author of the *Naked Gospel* calls himself a true Son of the Church of *England*; now the Doctrine of the Church of *England* is declared in her Liturgy, her Articles, and Homilies; in her Liturgy she hath inserted the Three Creeds, viz. that called the *Apostles*, the *Nicene*, and the *Athanasian*; these two last our Author would have to be restrained to the Letter of the former, because that only is used in the Offices for Administration of Baptism, and Visitation of the Sick; but if he be a true Son of the Church, he hath or should, *ex animo*, have given his Assent and Consent to all the Doctrines avowed by the Church. However, it is well that the Doctor seems to approve of the *Apostles Creed*, because I find the *Socinians* deny the Godhead of the Son and Holy Ghost, being it is not expressly affirmed in that Creed, yet certainly they had not been made Objects of our Faith, if they were not of the Godhead. This Creed is but a larger Profession of our Christian Faith, which we made at our Baptism, where we dedicate ourselves to the Service of that one God who is Father Son and Holy Ghost. The Right Reverend Bishop of *Chester* hath sufficiently proved the Deity of the Son and Holy Ghost, in his learned Exposition of that Creed: Nor have we ever heard of any of the Fathers that have interpreted it otherwise,

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

wife, than as the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creeds have done; yet I have been credibly informed, that a Doctor, who stiles himself of the Church of *England*, gravely declared, That this Creed also might be reformed. But in the Church of *England* we find the reiterated Acknowledgment of the Blessed Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, so in the Doxology, in the Form used in Baptism, and in the Litany, O Holy, Blessed and Glorious Trinity, Three Persons and One God, &c. And in that very ancient Hymn after the Communion, it is said of our Saviour, Thou only art Holy, thou only art the Lord; thou only O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the Glory of God the Father. In the Te Deum, Thou art the King of Glory O Christ; thou art the Everlasting Son of the Father.

In the first Article concerning the Trinity, the Church of *England* says, That in the Unity of the Divine Nature, there are three Persons of the same Essence, Power and Eternity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. In the Homely for *Whitsunday* she says, The Holy Ghost is a Spiritual and Divine Substance, the third Person in the Deity, distinct from the Father and the Son; Which thing may most easily be proved, by most plain Testimonies of God's Holy Word.

Canon 4.  
1640.

And in the *Canons* it is forbidden to read *Socinian Books*; And in the former Book of *Canons* we are forbid to teach any thing but what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old and New Testament; and what the ancient Fathers and Bishops have collected out of them.

It was therefore a *Protestatio contra factum*, to stile himself a true Son, &c. and under that Title to publish to the World what is so opposite to her Doctrine: May not the Church complain of such Sons in the words of the Prophet *Isaiah*, c. i. I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me? But God be thanked, the Church of *England* doth not want more dutiful Sons, such as on all occasions are ready and able to vindicate her Doctrines, and assert her Discipline: That famous University, whereof the Author was a Member, seasonably manifested her Detestation of his Heretical Opinions, by condemning them to the Flames, that there might not be a Spark left to kindle such dangerous Fires in the Church; which Decree, for the Reader's satisfaction, is here inserted:

*The Judgment and Decree of the University of Oxford, delivered in a Convocation held August 19th, 1690. against some Impious and Heretical Propositions, transcribed and quoted out of an Infamous Libel of late, perfidiously printed within the said University, and published with this Title, The Naked Gospel, which do Impugne and Assault the principal Mysteries of our Faith, alway retained and preserved in the Catholick Church, and especially in the Church of England.*

---

IMPRIMATUR,

*Jonathan Edwards, Vice-Can. Oxon.*

---

‘ **W** Hereas there is lately published an Infamous Libel, entituled, ‘ **The Naked Gospel**, which under that specious Title ‘ destroys the Foundation of the Primitive Faith once delivered to the ‘ Saints, assaults the chief Mysteries of our Religion, and not only denies, but reproacheth him that bought us, the Lord Jesus Christ, who ‘ is God blessed for ever. And whereas it appears that this Libel ‘ serving to be condemned to eternal Flames, hath been by an ‘ heard of Perfidiousness printed and published within this University, therefore for the Honour of the Holy and Individual Trinity, ‘ for Preservation of the Catholick Doctrine in the Church, and ‘ moreover, for the Defence (as much as in us lieth) of the Reputation and Esteem of this University, which with all care we desire to ‘ preserve intire and inviolable, We the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, ‘ Proctors, the Regent and Non-Regent, Masters convoked in a full ‘ Senate of Convocation, on the 19th of August, 1690, in manner and ‘ place accustomed, certain Propositions in the said Libel contained, ‘ which we have caused to be transcribed, and hereafter recited, being first Read, have by our Common Suffrages and the Unanimous ‘ Consent and Assent of Us all, Decreed in manner following:

I. ‘ We do Condemn all and every of these Propositions (and others to them belonging, which for Brevity’s sake are pretermitted) ‘ as False, Impious, and Contumelious to the Christian Religion, and ‘ especially to the Church of England; And we Decree and Declare ‘ most

## *An Answer to a late Treatise, Entitled,*

‘most of them to be Heretical, as contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and the Catholick Faith received and inviolably preserved by all Orthodox Christians in all the World in all Ages, from the beginning of the Church to this present time; and as repugnant to the Decrees of Councils, especially that of *Nice*, the most Solemn of all that are extant, and most worthy of our Faith and Acceptation; And lastly, as contrary to the Writings of the Fathers, especially of *St. Athanasius*, whose Faith and Patience in Defence of the Cause of Christ, was great beyond Example, will be memorably celebrated wheresoever the Gospel shall be preached.

II. ‘Moreover, We injoy under the Penalty of the Law, all Students not to read the said infamous Libel, or any of that kind, which do re-call, as from Hell, those anciently condemn’d Heresies; commanding and firmly enjoyning all and every the Prælectors, Tutors, Catechists, and others to whom the Institution of Accademical Youth is intrusted, that they diligently instruct and establish those that are committed to their Charge, in that chief and necessary Article of our Faith, upon which, as on a Foundation, all the rest do depend, by which we are taught to believe and profess, That there is One Living and True God, and in the Unity of this Nature, there are Three Persons of the same Essence, Power, and Eternity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

III. ‘We Decree the above-named Infamous Libel to be Burnt by an Infamous Hand, in the *Area* of our Schools.

### The Propositions referr’d to in the Decree.

*Pref. That Mahomet profess all the Articles of the Christian Faith.*

*Whether Mahomet or Christian Doctors have more corrupted the Gospel, is not so plain by the light of Scripture, as it is by that of Experience, that the later gave occasion, encouragement, and advantage to the former. For when by nice and hot Disputes, (especially concerning the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity) the minds of the whole People had been long confounded, and by the then late Establishment of Image-Worship, the Scandal was increased, so that to vulgar Understandings the Doctrine of the Trinity appeared no less guilty of Polytheism, then that of Image-Worship did of Idolatry—Then was there a tempting Opportunity offered to the Impostor, and he laid hold on it, to set up himself for a Reformer of such Corruptions, as were both too gross to be justified, and too visible to be denied.*

Cap. 7. pag. 40. *The great Question concerning the Godhead of Christ is,*  
 1. *Impertinent to our Lord’s design.* 2. *Fruitless to the Contemplators own purpose.* 3. *Dangerous.*

Cap.



## The Naked Gospel.

5

Cap. 8. pag. 46. Two Evangelists trace our Lord's Genealogy; but as they derive it not from his real but supposed Father, so do they take two several ways, not to satisfy but to amuse us. What is this but to admonish us against Curiosity? The Pedigree of his Flesh might easily have been, either cleared or unmentioned: Had the Evangelists been wholly silent concerning it, we had less wondered; but that they should profess to instruct us, yet doubly disappoint us, first by deriving it from a wrong Father, and then by distracting us between two ways; What is this but to verify the Prophet's description, Who shall declare his Generation? And what doth this so careful Concealment of his Generation according to the Humane Nature signify more plainly, than a warning against searching after his Eternal Generation of his Divinity? If it were needless (and therefore left impossible) to prove him derived from David, which was one of his most revealed Characters; how can it be otherwise, to understand that Generation of his, which must needs be so much the more above our Understanding, as the Nature of God is above our own.

Pag. 48. And might not a Heathen at this rate justify Polytheism, provided his Gods disagreed not among themselves? The Schoolmen therefore will not stand to this State of the Question, but distinguish between Person and suppositum rationale; which (yet) they cannot so do, as to satisfy themselves, and therefore shelter themselves in their impregnable Fort, Mystery, and thence thunder upon the Adversaries both of this, and of another no less beloved Mystery: For they make this their Cock-argument for Transubstantiation; That since the Scripture is no less express for the One than the Other, and the Contradictions no less gross in the One than in the Other; therefore we must embrace the one as well as the other.

To this Objection of the Romanists, and to others of the Unitarians, we have found an Answer, That we must not infer from our Own Nature to God's; for that Ours is finite, and God's is infinite; Three Persons among Us are Three Men, because they agree in one Common Nature; but the Divine Nature is not a Common One, but a Singular; and therefore Three Persons do not make Three Gods. If you understand not this, you must not wonder, or at least you must not gainsay it; for it is a Mystery, which Reason may not pretend to fathom.

Pag. 51. Thus have we pointed (and only pointed) at some of the many intangling Questions, which puzzled and divided the subtillest Wits of several Ages, and were at last decided by no other Evidence, but of Imperial and Papal Authority; sufficient to silence Disputes, but not establish Truth. And who is he that is not discouraged from giving a confident Assent to what is this way obtruded upon his Belief?

Cap. 9. pag. 53. I. There is danger of Blasphemy in examining the Silly Question (as he calls it) concerning the Eternity of the Godhead of Christ.

C

This

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entitled,

*This is a second danger, That we have no firm ground to go upon—*

Pag. 54. *The only advantage of the Catholics is long Possession, and that after Sentence— They have indeed so handled Matters, as to hide much, and varnish all; yet even so, we may pick out enough to justify an Appeal, by observing how that Possession was first obtained, then continued, and at last settled— The Sentence which first determined the Controversy [in the Council of Nice] was not by the Merit of the Cause, but Interest of the Parties.*

Pag. 56. *This long and mischievous Controversy was at last settled by Theodosius; who having received his Instructions and Baptism from a Consubstantialist, required all his Subjects to conform to that Religion, which Peter the Prince of the Apostles from the beginning had delivered to the Romans, and which at that time Damasus Bishop of Rome, and Peter Bishop of Alexandria held; and that Church only should be esteemed Catholick which worshipped the Divine Trinity with equal Honour; and those which held the other should be called Hereticks, made infamous, and punished.*

*This therefore we may call settling the Controversy; because thenceforth all succeeding Emperors, and Bishops wrote after this Copy, and both the Parties have ever worn these Titles, which the Emperor by his Imperial Power, as the unquestionable Fountain of Honor, was pleased to bestow upon them. — Behold now the Ground upon which one of our Fundamental Articles of Faith is Built; behold the Justice of that Plea, which from such a Possession would prescribe to our Belief.*

Pag. 57. *of the Interpolated Edition, What more ridiculously silly than to build so weighty a Doctrine upon Implicit Faith in two Bishops, partial to their own Sees, whereof the one gave it Birth, and the other Maintenance? And what more odious than to persecute as Hereticks and Malefactors, all such as should refuse to be so grossly imposed upon.*

Pag. 57. *of the first Edition, Certainly whoever shall carefully observe how the now established Doctrine was from first to last advanced by gross Partiality of the most guilty kind, and at last imposed by a Novice Emperor, upon Implicit Faith of two Bishops, of whose Sees, the one brought it into the World, and the other maintain'd it, and a new coin'd Tradition lately obtruded by the guiltier of those Sees, but unpleaded, because unheard of in those former, long and miserable Times, which it might, and ought to have delivered from the Convulsions they suffered: Whoever, I say, shall carefully observe this, and withal what foul Tricks the Church of Rome used in the West, and with what ill Success in the East, whose Churches did at last more Universally embrace Arrius's Opinion, than at first they condemned it; may be tempted to number the Athanasian, among the Roman Doctrines, and cannot but think it fairly dealt with, if (its boasted Possession pardoned) it be left upon the same level with the Arrian, equally unworthy not only of our Faith, but of our Study.*



Pag. 57. If further we consider (what the Historian expressly declareth) that at the rise of this Controversie, most of the Bishops understood not it's meaning, we cannot think it necessary to Salvation, that every private Christian should believe that as an Article of Faith, which the best Ages of the Church thought not worth knowing. — [This upon second thoughts is thus express'd in a 2d Edition. An Opinion which so many wise and good Men as lived within 300 Years after Christ, were so far from believing Matter of Faith, that they did not receive it as Matter of Certainty, nor perhaps of Credibility. Pag. 59.]

Pag. 58. The Athanasians abhor Polytheism, no less than do the Arrians. If their Positions seem to infer it, they deny the consequence; if this contradict the Rules of reasoning, they avow it; for they allow Reason no bearing in Mysteries of Faith: if this make them Hereticks, it is not in Religion, but in Logick.

On the other side, the Arrians profess to believe of Christ whatever himself, or his Apostles have spoken; and where one expression in Scripture seemeth to contradict another, they take such a Course to reconcile them, as the Laws and Customs of all the World direct. It is very frequent for Rhetorick to exceed, but never to diminish the Grammatical Character of a Person, whose honour the Writer professeth to advance: and upon this account they think it more reasonable, that those Expressions which exalt our Saviour's Person to an Equality with the Father, should stoop to those which speak him Inferior; than that those which speak him Inferior should be strained up to those which speak him Equal. And however, this is the safer Way; since it will lead us to such a Belief, as will suffice for that end, for whose sake alone Belief itself is required.

Pag. 70. To this Question, Whether any Promise of God does necessarily import a Restitution of the same Numerical Matter?

He answers, That the Words of St. Paul; Thou fool, that which thou sowest, &c. plainly deny the Resurrection of the same Numerical Particles.

P. 70. To another Question, Whether it be more honourable to God, and more serviceable to the design of the Gospel, that we believe the Contrary?

He answers, That it is the same, as to ask, Whether it be more honourable to save all his Perfections, or to robb one, that we may cloath the other.

The very mentioning of these Opinions is a sufficient Confutation to all such as have heartily imbraced the Doctrine of the Church of England. But the Author, in his Vindication, pretends, that what he hath written was only to enlarge Charity, (i. e.) to procure a Tolera-

# *An Answer to a late Treatise, Entitled,*

ration of such Opinions as he hath published: I shall only discover that Line of *Socinianism*, much blacker than his Ink, which runs through his whole Book, and then the Reader may judge to what his enlarged Charity doth tend.

The Design of the Preface is to shew, saith the Doctor, that the Success of the Gospel, which made such great Conquests at first, hath been hindred by the difference of the Modern Gospel from the Primitive, in its Doctrine, which difference, he says, is so great, *that if an Apostle should return into the World, he would be so far from owning it, that he would not be able to understand it.*

*Ans.* If the Gospel which we receive be so intirely corrupted, he doth utterly overthrow that Providence of God which he admires in giving it so great a success, whereas all good Christians believe the Gospel to be the same, and bless the Providence of Almighty God in preserving it pure and uncorrupt to this present time; and we still say, *if an Apostle or an Angel from Heaven shall preach any other Gospel, contrary to, or not besides what we have received, let him be accursed.* I hope therefore the Doctor doth not think of setting up any other Judge of Controversies than what the Church, whereof he calls himself a True Son, doth own and profess; if the Success of it hath been hindred in any Age, it may not be imputed to the Doctrine therein delivered, nor to the Providence of God, in preserving it intire, but to those false and contrary Doctrines, which by the Instruments of Satan, transforming themselves into Angels of Light, endeavoured to destroy in its infancy, such as *St. Peter* calls *damnable errors*, denying the Lord that bought them, and teaching that *Jesus Christ* was not come in the flesh; (*i. e.*) that God the Word was not made flesh, but the flesh was made God. Such were *Ebion* a Jew, *Cerintus* and *Marcion*, who spread their Errors against the Deity of Christ, while *St. John* was living, with which Errors the Church of *Ephesus* was so infested, that she besought *St. John* to write in confutation of them, as he did both in his Gospel and Epistles. The other Apostles were diligent in confuting the Errors of the *Gnosticks*, who would have brought in the worshipping of Saints and Angels as inferior Gods. These generally condemned *St. Paul's* Epistles, and kept to the Jewish Observations, which (the Apostles wrote against) the *Nicolaitans* also mentioned, *Rev.* 2. 6. were of the like Opinion with the *Gnosticks* and *Cerintus*. For hating of whose Deeds the Church of *Ephesus* is commended. *Ireneus*, l. 3. c. 11. says, *that St. John wrote his Gospel to destroy that Error which had been sown by Cerintus, and before him by the Nicolaitans.* So that the Success of the Gospel was hindred by not only those false Doctrines, but the impure Lives of the *Gnosticks* and

## The Naked Gospel.

9

and *Nicolaitans*, whose deeds God hated. *Mahomet* was of the same Opinion with those Hereticks; for though the Doctor says, he professed all the Articles of the Christian Faith, yet it's evident he denied the Deity of Christ, though he owned him to be a true Prophet and Messenger of God; in which respect (the Doctor might say) he owned as much of the Christian Faith as the *Socinians* do, and we may say he was for a **Naked Gospel** as well as the Doctor.

The Question therefore which the Doctor makes, whether *Mahomet* or Christian Doctors have more corrupted the Gospel and hindered the success of it, is easily resolved; for the *Gnosticks*, *Cerinthians*, *Ebionites*, &c. all which called themselves Christian Doctors and Reformers of the Gospel, as he calls *Mahomet*. Were those Christian Doctors, who by their corrupt and Antichristian Errors, defamed the Gospel, and opposed the Deity of its Author? And these and such others made way for *Mahomet*, by shewing, that they held a Gospel, whereof every Article was to be found in the *Alcoran*. And had our Doctor lived in the days of *Mahomet*, it's not unlike but he might have been one of those Christian Doctors, that would have reformed the Gospels according to the *Alcoran*. As for any new Additions or Impositions in Matters of Faith, the Doctor knows the Church of *England* utterly disclaims them. And to avoid such traditionary Impositions, the Church of *England* (retaining whatsoever is agreeable to the Scriptures and Primitive Churches,) hath reformed herself from all the corrupt Innovations and Impositions of the Church of *Rome*, as well in Matters of Doctrine as of Government and Discipline.

And now to the Doctor's Question, *Whether Mahomet or the Christian Doctors have more corrupted the Gospel, &c.*

This was the Tempting Opportunity (says the Doctor) offered to the Impostor, and he laid hold on it, to set up himself for a Reformer. Sir *W. Temple*, p. 107. of the Second Part of his *Essays*, may inform him who was the fore-runner of Anti-Christ, as the Fathers termed *Arian*. About the Year 600, the time when *Mahomet* appeared, the Provinces of the East were over-run with *Arianism*, who denied or undermined the Divinity of Christ, and allowed only his Prophetical Office. The Countries of *Arabia* and *Egypt* were filled with great numbers of the scattered *Jews*, who on the destruction of their Country in *Adrian's* time, had fled into these Provinces, to avoid the utter ruine of their Nation, threatened by that Emperour. *Arabia* and *Egypt* were inhabited by *Gentiles*, who were given to pleasures and Riches. *Mahomet*, to humour and comply with these three sorts of men, and by assistance of *Sergius* a Monk (an *Arian* Heretic,) who fearing the Censure of the Church of *Constantinople*, which then

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

then resolved to suppress that, and the Heresie of the *Monothelites*, fled into *Arabia*, and was entertained by *Mahomet's* Master, where he grew into acquaintance with *Mahomet*, and became his only Confident; framed a Scheme of Religion which might take in the common Opinions and Dispositions of all those three Parties, which yet might be agreeable to his own temper and designs. He professed One God, Creator of the World, and that God sent *Moses* his first and great Prophet, to give his Laws to Mankind, which were not obeyed by the *Jews*, nor received by the Gentiles, therefore in later Ages he sent Christ, who was the second Prophet, and greater than *Moses*, to preach his Laws in greater purity, but to do it with gentleness, patience, and humility, which found no better reception or success among Men, than *Moses* had done; and therefore God had now sent his last and greatest Prophet *Mahomet*, to publish his Laws with more Power, to subdue them by Force and Violence, who would not willingly receive them; that such as would not obey, should be ruined; but the obedient should have the possession of his, and their Enemies, as a Reward in this Life, and a Paradise hereafter, with all sensual enjoyments, especially of beautiful Women, newly created for that purpose: these prevailed with *Arians*, *Jews*, and *Gentiles*, in those parts, &c.

Hence it appears, what this Reformer was, and what were the tempting opportunities which he laid hold on.

To please the *Jews*, *Mahomet* observed Circumcision, in imitation of *Abraham*, and recommended to them the Laws of *Moses*; to please the *Gentiles*, he permitted Polygamy, to the number of four Wives, and as many Concubines as they could maintain; and to please the *Christians*, he permitted them to have a *Naked Gospel*, and a Natural Faith in Christ, as a Messenger of G O D: greater than *Moses*; but not God, or the Saviour of the World; for they deny that he was crucified, but was taken up alive into Heaven: but these are not all the Articles of the Christian Faith, he denied the Crucifixion of our Saviour, his Resurrection, Ascension, and that he should come to Judge the World, to reward or punish Men according to their Works. *Sandius*, p. 347. mentioneth some other of *Mahomet's* Doctrines: As that God is One both in Essence and Person, and that there are not Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that Christ is to be worshipped, but not with that Divine Worship as his Lord and God is: He says, That *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and every one that worshippeth and feareth God, and doth Good Works, may be saved; and he quotes *Baronius*, saying, *That the Mahomitans do worship Christ, as the Arians and Nestorians do*, p. 348.

The

## The Naked Gospel.

11

The Author of *Mabomet's Life*, Printed before the *English Alchoran*, says, *He was ordained to be a Scourge for the Christians, who in multitudes at that time, had forsaken the Truth, to follow the Sects and Heresies of the Arrians, Nestorians, Donatists, and others.* By such as these, the Candlestick, by God's just Judgment, was removed out of the *Asian Churches* at first; and the pure Light of the Gospel is much darkened in these later Ages, by *Anti-Trinitarians, Servetians, and Socinians*, who have well nigh extinguished that Gospel, which is the Light of the World, and would leave Mankind as naked, and as much ashamed as our first Parents, when they had eaten of the forbidden Fruit.

I confess, that when I first read, that *Mabomet* profest all the Articles of Christ's Faith, I was not aware, that the Doctor might mean according to his New Gospel, or the *Socinian Creed*; but on enquiry into the *Alchoran*, and computation of Time, when the *Alchoran* was written, (*viz.*) about the year 600, before which time the whole World, as *St. Hierome* observed, was become *Arrian*; and *Sergius* the Monk, that had a chief hand in contriving it, was an *Arrian*, I found that the Doctor makes a very great Agreement in Matters of Faith, between the *Alchoran* and his **Naked Gospel**; so that as he says, *Mabomet* set up for a Reformer of the Gospel in his time; so we have another *Sergius* who sets up for a Reformer of the Gospel according to the *Alchoran* in our time, as by the following particulars will appear.

The *English Alchoran*, as it is Reprinted 1688, (is that which I quote) p. 3. speaking to the Christians: *Mabomet*, says, *Say not God hath a Companion equal to him, because you know the contrary.* P. 4. *God created the Heavens and the Earth, and then ascended into Heaven.* P. 44. *Zachary prayed to God for a Progeny, the Angels declared to him from God, That he should have a Son called John, he shall affirm the Messiah to be the Word of God; Jesus is with God, as is Adam, God created him out of the Earth; I do not associate (God) him with any one, and acknowledge no other Lord but him.* P. 46. *There is no God, but God alone, the Omnipotent and Wise.* P. 86. *There be some that alter the Scripture in reading it, and will make us believe that what we read is in the Scripture, though it be not; they blaspheme, and know it well: God gave not to Men the Scripture, Knowledge, and Prophecies, to say to the People, Worship me instead of God; but that they should say, Observe exactly what you read in the Scripture: God doth not command you to adore Angels or Prophets.* P. 48. *We believe in what was inspired by Moses, Jesus, and generally by all the Prophets: Abraham was not of them that believe in many Gods.* P. 49. *Follow ye the Law of Abraham, that is pleasing to him; he profest the Unity of the Divine Majesty; he was not of them that believe in many Gods.*

P.



P. 94. Certainly they that believe *Messias*, the Son of Mary, to be God, are impious. The *Messias* commanded the Children of Israel to worship God, his, and their Lord. Paradise is forbidden to him that shall say, God hath a Companion equal to him. Such as affirm, there are Three Gods, are impious. P. 86. The *Messias*, the Son of Mary, is a Prophet and Apostle of God, like to the Prophets that came before him: His Mother is Holy, say to him, Who can binder God to extirminate the *Messias*, and his Mother. P. 86. Of the Jews, he says, few of them shall believe, because of their Malice and Blasphemies vomited against Mary. They said, We have slain the *Messias*, *Jesus* the Son of Mary, the Prophet and Apostle of God: Certainly they slew him not, neither crucified him; they crucified one that resembled him: such as doubt it are in a manifest Error; for God took him up to himself. Such as have the knowledge of the Scripture, ought to believe in *Jesus* before his Death, he shall be a Witness against them in the Day of Judgment. P. 80, 81. You shall hear many Christians that have an inclination towards true Believers, and have Priests, and Religious that are humble, and their eyes full of tears, say, Lord we believe in thy Law, write us in the Number of them that profess thy Unity. P. 95. He shall say in the Day of Judgment, O *Jesus*, didst thou injoyne thy People to Worship Thee, and thy Mother, as two Gods: *Jesus* shall answer, Praised be thy Name, I will take heed of speaking what is not true; I delivered nothing but what thou commandest me to speak, (viz.) Worship God your Lord, and mine, p. 99. Infidels believe not in his Unity, p. 101.

The Jews say, That the Son of God is most just and powerful. The Christians say, That the *Messias* is the Son of God: their words are like the words of Infidels; but God shall lay on them his Curse, p. 153. Consider how they blaspheme, they adore their Doctors and Priests, and the *Messias* also, the Son of Mary, who commanded them to worship One God alone; there is but one sole God, there is nothing equal to him: they would extinguish the Light of God, but he shall not suffer them.

How the *Naked Gospel* agreeth with the *Aleboran* in most of these particulars, might be shewn; but he that reads it will be soon satisfied, that it is a Commentary on that Text.

But since the Doctor, or some one for him, hath written his Vindication, I shall briefly consider what is said in Defence of those Propositions condemned by the University.

And first I observe, That in these Propositions, and what may be added to them from the *Naked Gospel*, the quintessence of the *Arian* and *Socinian* Controversies is contracted and composed, *Secundum Artem*; and by him, or some other on his behalf, recommended as a safe means to promote a General Comprehension, and an enlarged Charity; but to the destruction of Catholick Verity.

Now

Now because these Propositions are not only published in several Impressions of that Libel, but defended by the Author, or some other on his behalf; and the Gangreen begins to spread among prophane and unstable Wits, which too much abound, it seemed necessary to provide an Antidote against those old Errors, to which the Author hath given a new Resurrection, like that which he maintains of our Bodies, not in the same form, but another more agreeable to his new Divinity and Philosophy, and equally opposite to the written Gospel, as understood by the Primitive Fathers, and received by the Church of England.

The difference which the Author fancieth to be made in the Gospel, is the preaching of the Doctrine of the Eternal Deity of our Saviour, which this Author explodes, as not to be comprehended by his Reason, and not agreeable to that Natural Religion which he makes the Foundation of the Gospel; now, if there be any alteration made, it is by those which have denied the Eternal Deity of our Saviour; for as I said, while St. *John* was yet living, *Ebion* and *Cerinthus* began that Heresie. *Ebion* taught, That Christ was a meer Man, and had no existence before he was born into the World; of which the Church of *Ephesus* then complained to St. *John*, desiring him to write in Confutation of that Heresie; and *Justin Martyr*, and *Irenaeus* brand this Heresie, as did *Ignatius* before them, and St. *John* before him; who called such as denied that Jesus Christ was come in the Flesh, Deceivers, and Antichrists.

*Cerinthus* held a pre-existence of Reason, or the Word, which he says descended on our Saviour at his Baptism, and ascended from him into Heaven, when he was crucified; for which Opinions, St. *John* meeting him in a Bath, fled from his company, as fearing least the Walls of the Bath, wherein he was, might fall on him.

Against these Heresies St. *John* being importun'd, wrote his Gospel purposely to assert the Divine Essence of the Son of God, as he tells us, *ch. 20. 31. These things are written, that ye might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through his name.* And besides the Historical part of that Gospel, the whole is one continued Argument for the Confirmation of this Truth, which we shall have occasion to speak of more at large; and shall only observe here what he says, *1 Job. 5. 20. We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, to know him that is true. This is the true God, and eternal life:* And in the *2 Epistle, v. 7. Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver, and an Antichrist.* And *1 Job. 5. 7.* he plainly asserts the Doctrine of the Trinity, *There are three that bear witness in heaven,*

*An Answer to a late Treatise, Entitled,*

*the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One.* It is very observable what *Grotius* says in the Preface of his Annotations on *St. John*, *The Ancients, among other causes of St. John's Writing this Gospel, do generally assign this as the chief, that he might apply a Remedy to that Poison, which at that time was dispersed in the Church among all that professed the Name of Christ:* which could be no other, than the denying of the Eternal Deity of the Son of God, which that Evangelist asserted.

Now tho' it may seem a superfluous work to enquire into the Opinions of the Author of the *Naked Gospel*, after the Censure of the University, the reading whereof may satisfy any Judicious and Impartial Reader, yet least I should seem to make an Adversary where I find none, and to fight against my own Shadow, as against some formidable Monster, I shall 1. Consider what the Author hath said to clear himself from the Reasons of that Decree. 2. Make some few general Remarks on the design of the *Naked Gospel*. And 3<sup>d</sup>, More particularly Examine the Opinions asserted, or insinuated by the Author.

In his Vindication, p. 4. he declares his Faith to be no other than that of the Church of *England*, and renounceth any word, which in that, or any other Book may seem to contradict it.

The Contradiction is not seeming, but real, and differs as much as Time doth from Eternity; or the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, of which I have given an account from the *Arrian* and *Socinian* Heresies; if he renounceth any thing, he must renounce almost all; but how he will do it, so as to remove the Scandal from the Church of *England*, which, as *Monsieur Jeru* observes, is now conceived to be tainted with *Socinian* Doctrines, from such Writings as this of the *Naked Gospel*, I cannot well conceive, unless he disclaim his being a true Son of the Church of *England*.

He says, The Author of that Book is so far from denying the Divinity of Christ, that he plainly asserts it. But what Divinity is that? is it the Eternal Godhead, and Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father? This is not to be found, yea, it is the whole design of the Author to impugn it; he grants him (no other Divinity than the *Arrians* did, of a created God, nor indeed so much; for he speaks of our Saviour under the same Notions and Expressions as *Socinus* and *Smolens* did, granting him a Divinity but not a Deity, of which more hereafter.

But he would prove his Assertion from these words of his, *That the Author of our Gospel was not only great but infinite*: But the Question is, whom he means by our Author, whether God the Father the prime,

or



or God the Son as the immediate Author; for thus the Moral Law was given by *Moses*, yet God was the prime Author; and in this sense an *Arrian* may, and the *Socinians* do say Christ was the Messenger of God, and received all his Commands from God, and so the Author of the Gospel in the *Socinians* sense is infinite; for thus *Crellius* on *Heb.* 2. v. 3. says, *Christ was not the first Author of the Gospel, as neither were the Angels of the Law, but God was the prime Author of both the Law and Gospel, though the Law was published by Angels, and the Gospel by Christ; so that Christ was no otherwise a Law-giver in publishing the Gospel, than Moses was in proclaiming the Law: which Crellius in his Book de Uno Deo endeavours to maintain at large; and in the same sense I fear the Doctor calls the Author of our Gospel infinite, viz. that God the Father is the Author of the Gospel. But being conscious that some Expressions unsuitable to so plain an Assertion as that of the Infinity of the Author of the Gospel, might drop from his hasty Pen, he says p. 9. that such hasty Expressions ought to be thereby (i. e.) by the word Infinity, to be interpreted.*

*Ans.* And so it might, if he had applied it to the Person of Christ, but he tells us the occasion of that Expression was, *Cb. 11.* from the assurance of a Christian grounded on the Resurrection, beyond the hopes of a Heathen, and the Persons in whom the one and the other believed: Now whom do the *Arrians* believe to be the Author of that Resurrection, but God the Father, whom they often affirm to have raised our Saviour from the Dead; and its no wonder if they own his Infinity, this being the substance of what they say is necessary to be believed, viz. *That God raised Jesus from the Dead, and so confess him our Lord; denying that Christ arose by any power of his own.*

Therefore he would not have his Expressions imputed to his *sected* Opinion, but his too great hast and heat in a Question which did not concern the *Divinity of Christ*, but the *manner of his Generation*; the former (as he adds) was on both sides acknowledged, the latter was the whole subject of the Dispute, which *Constantine's* Letter so often calleth Silly.

*Ans.* If the *Divinity of Christ* in its proper sense, (i. e.) his Deity, had been acknowledged, I believe there had been no dispute concerning the manner of his Generation; the Question was, Whether he were *Consubstantial* with the Father or not; not concerning the manner or *modus*, but whether he were *ipsius*, of the same Substance with the Father?

If the Dispute in *Constantine's* time had been only about the manner of Christ's Generation, the Doctor might have taken in the Paren-

*An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,*

thesis of Dr. *Wallis*, (that it is not distinctly declared by God, nor are we able fully to comprehend it, nor is it necessary for us to know) but it is necessary to know that this Generation was from Eternity, that we may ground our Faith and Hope in him that is God, and so is able to save to the utmost all that come to God by him, he being the Lord, (*i. e.*) *Jebovab*) our Righteousness. What the Controversy in the *Nicene Council* against *Arrius* was, and how it was decided, shall appear anon.

2<sup>ly</sup>, He says, the design of his Book was *only to disable Humane Authority from imposing on our Belief more Doctrines than Christ and his Apostles declared to be necessary*. Here are two bold Strokes; first the Doctor will determine what those necessary Doctrines are, and then he will disable Magistrates from imposing any other; and so we shall lose the great Fundamental, the Eternal Godhead of Christ, which his *Naked Gospel* doth impugn.

3<sup>ly</sup>, Another design of this Author, he says is, *By a due confinement of Faith to enlarge Charity*. *Ans.* The Apostles method to enlarge Charity, was not to confine, but propagate the Faith once delivered to the Saints, as the best motive to Charity, *we have one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*, but (such as the Author is) the *Socinians*, deny the Lord that bought them, destroy the Foundation of Faith in the Godhead, and satisfaction of Christ, and wholly disannul Baptism, and so cut asunder this triple Cord that obligeth Christians to Charity; and indeed as they acknowledge not the one Lord, so they nullify the one Faith in him, and make the one Baptism of no effect, and therefore have utterly destroyed Charity.

The next charge of exposing the Divinity of Christ, he says *p. 5.* hath no other evidence but this, *That he is sometimes stiled a crucified Vagabond*; and this he says is but once, *viz.* in the Introduction. But was it not said with as little modesty, *p. 21. c. 2.* *That he was a Vagabond Galilean*; which expressions by the Rule of *Fortiter calumniare a liquod adherebit*, will not excuse him, by saying he personated an Infidel; such playing with Holy Things, is much worse than his play at push Pin.

*P. 6.* he protesteth, *That in his whole life he never spent so much time in reading Socinian Books, as put altogether would amount to one whole day*. By spending so much time, I suppose he means he did not lose or mispend it, but it was well bestowed; or perhaps he made the *Arrian* Controversy his chief Study, which is as contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of England, as the *Socinian*. So *Socinus* protested he never read *Arrius*, *Credat Judæum*.

I would here remind the Doctor of the excellent Advice of the incomparable King Charles the First, mentioned by himself, in his Preface, *I would have you, as I hope you are already, well grounded and settled in your Religion, the best Profession whereof I have ever esteemed that of the Church of England, in which you have been Educated, &c.* It is well known that the Doctor was not only educated in the Church of England, but to that very time when he wrote his **Naked Gospel**, that is till he was sixty five Years old, as he computes his Age, he hath lived in the Communion of that Church; we may therefore marvel, how he was so soon removed from him that called him to the Grace of Christ, unto another Gospel (as St. Paul expresseth it, *Gal. 1. 6.*) which would pervert the Gospel of Christ: Did he not judiciously make the Doctrine of the Church of England his own, as that Blessed King advised? Did he not by his own judgment and reason, but by his hand only seal to the Bond which Education had written, or take it up only on Mens Customs or Traditions, as that good King speaks; if so, he was guilty of great Oscitancy in the matter of Religion, on which Salvation depends; or if after so long Profession of the Doctrine of the Church, he began to entertain some doubts of the truth of it, he was guilty of great Levity in so weighty a Matter, not to bestow many Years in the Examination of the Errors of that Doctrine which he forsook, and embracing another vastly and dangerously differing from it, without bestowing so much as one Day's reading the Grounds and Reasons of it. On supposition therefore, that the Doctor hath embraced either the *Arrian* or *Socinian* Doctrines, he was unaccountably rash (there being so many Books written by learned Men of both Parties) to leave a Religion which he had so long profest, and had time to enquire into, and without more than one Days study, in a Case of such consequence, to fall off to a contrary Opinion. This may tempt Men to think it was done in a Pet; some may think, because he was not removed to a higher Station, as he intimates, somewhere, the Archbishop promised he should in some short time, but being not done, he thought to remind him of his Promise by Dedicating that Book of a *Constant Communicant* to his Grace; yet after all he was left in that Place where he spent three Pence of his own to every Penny of his Preferment: For my part I have a better opinion of the Doctor, and that he had long studied, and often discoursed with learned Men concerning the *Socinian* Controversy, and that the **Naked Gospel** was the product of many Years spent in Reading, Conference and Meditation on those Points, before he came to a Resolution. For I have heard of a Doctor of his Age, who often discoursed with his Father, a Reverend Divine, concerning some *Arminian*, *Pelagian*, and

*Socinian*

*Socinian Points*, and in heat of disputation did tell his Father, That it would not be well till we came up to the *Socinian Doctrine*; this was many years since. And what means his sitting down when the *Atbanasian Creed* was said, but his contempt of it.

The next Charge is, *That the Godhead of our Saviour is declared to be an impertinent and dangerous Speculation.* This he thinks is discharged by the former distinction, of the manner of the Generation, &c. and adds, *That those Fathers who were the most earnest Assertors of the Doctrine of Christ's Divinity*, (he doth not say of his Eternal Deity) *were also the most severe Censurers of Curiosity concerning the manner of his Generation.* And our Author is a Son of those Fathers, who granted a Created Deity to our Saviour, and most severely censured those that held his Eternal Generation, as being guilty of Polytheism, which is often intimated by him. This is the sum of the Author's Defence.

I would willingly know of what sort of Divinity it is, that he ascribes to our Saviour, because I find that the *Arrians* acknowledge, that he is a Created God; and the *Socinians* grant a Divinity, but not so much as a Created Deity. I see no more granted him, as to his Person, by the *Socinians* than by the *Turks*, which acknowledge he was a Divine Man, and a true Prophet, or Messenger of God: This Divinity he learnt of *Smaleins*, as I shall show hereafter, or of *Crellins*, as is already shewn, whose words as well as sense he so often repeats, as will give great cause to the Reader to conclude, that he spent more than one whole Day in reading the *Socinian Controversies*.

The general Remarks which I shall make on the *Stated Gospel*, are as follow:

1. That whereas the Author pretends the special Design of it is to enlarge Charity, yet that Charity is only designed for a Toleration of the *Arrian* and *Socinian Doctrines*, and he sharply reflects on all such as he perceived to be averse from such his enlarged Charity, p. 39. Col. 1. *If Bishop Alexander the first Author of the Nicety, thought fit to tolerate the Arrians, we can ill pretend to Charity if we allow them no title to God's Pardon, or his Church's Communion.*

P. 57. of his interpolated Edition, he pleads, *That nothing can be more odious than to persecute as Hereticks and Malefactors, all such as should refuse to be imposed on, viz. by the Bishops that asserted the Trinity.*

P. 11. of his *Vindication*, he recommends the charitable Heresie of the *Lacitudinarians*, under which term he may comprehend all sort of Heresies, an universal Toleration without any reserve, which hath been pleaded for in former times.

2. That through the whole Book it is not so much the manner of the Generation that is insisted on, but the Eternity of it is denied, and

## The Naked Gospel.

19

so this end the Arguments of the *Arrians* are applauded, and the Reasons and Scriptures that affirm it, are either suppressed, or ridicul'd.

To begin with the Propositions referred to in the Decree, he tells us, *That Mahomet did profess all the Articles of the Christian Faith: but Mahomet did not profess the Eternal Generation of the Son of God; therefore this is no Article of the Christian Faith, in the Doctor's Opinion.*

What the Charity of the *Socinians* is, toward such as hold the Doctrine of the Church of England, we may learn from *Smalcus*, at the end of his Book, concerning the Divinity of Christ: *We doubt not to affirm boldly, that not one of all those who believe Jesus Christ of himself God, can ever by any means have certain hope of Eternal Life, by virtue of his Opinion concerning Christ. Hence they call us, Polytheists, Antichristians; and say, we are not worthy of the Name of Christians. This is Charity enlarged.*

In the same Paragraph he says, *When by nice and hot Disputes, concerning, especially the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity, the Minds of the People had been long confounded, so that, to vulgar understandings, the Doctrine of the Trinity appeared no less guilty of Polytheism, than that of Image-worship did of Idolatry; then was there a tempting opportunity offered to the Impostor, and he laid hold on it to set up himself for a reformer of such corruptions as were both too gross to be justified, and too visible to be denied. Now what did this Impostor reform, but the Doctrine of the Trinity, denying the Godhead of the Son and Holy Ghost, as such corruptions which were too gross to be justified, and too visible to be denied. It is a credible History of those Times, which I have related, that one *Sergius* a Monk, and some other Apostate Christians, join'd with *Mahomet* in compiling the *Aleboran*; these retained so much veneration for our Saviour as to grant him what the *Socinians* do, a kind of Divinity; for they acknowledge him to be a true Prophet, and so he may be called Divine, as we call *St. John*, by way of Eminency, *The Divine*: and so our *Socinian* Reformers agree with the *Mahometans*, some say the Doctrine of the Trinity was laid aside to make way for the Turks to become Christians; but we find a contrary effect, that many Christians turn Turks.*

I hope the Reader is satisfied, by what I collected out of the *Aleboran*, that *Mahomet* and his *Arian* Genius purposely designed to overthrow the Doctrine of the Trinity, and to represent our Saviour as a meer Man, though as a Messenger of God. And what less is implied in these words of the Doctor's, *That to vulgar understandings the Doctrine of the Trinity appeared no less guilty of Polytheism, than that of Image-worship did of Idolatry?* The



The next Proposition is This, *When the great Question concerning the eternity of his (i.e.) Christ's Godhead first embroiled the World, Constantine condemned it as a silly Question, fitter for Fools and Children, than for Priests or wise Men.* Note here; The Question was not concerning the Manner of the Generation of our Saviour, but the Eternity of his Godhead, and how justly this Censure of Constantine's was past on that Question, this Author says, we may discover in three particulars. 1. *It was impertinent to our Lord's Design.* 2. *Fruitless to the Contemplator's own purpose.* 3. *It is dangerous.* This is Socinianism in grain.

Now, because the Author would excuse himself from this Charge, by pleading, that he only relates the Opinion of Constantine, the consideration of that good Emperor's management and determination of this great Question, is more strictly and fully to be weighed. This Author tells us, p. 31. Col. 2. *Such was the judgment of the great Constantine, when the Game was first set on foot.* How it was then by the Arian party represented to him, is not evident: they dealt subtilly, but after that, he had called the Nicene Council, and was fully informed of the state of the Question; he was so far from thinking it silly and vain, that he wrote Letters to several Churches to inform them, that after mature consideration, the Opinion of Arius was condemned, branded the Arians with the Name of Porphyrians, caused their Books to be burnt, and threatned death to any that should conceal them; and hearing of the miserable end of that wretched man, as it is described by Socrates, he made it his business to extirpate it. No doubt the Doctor knew these passages related of Constantine, as well as those which he mentions, calling it a Silly Question, and fitter for Boys than for Priests; what can he plead then for proclaiming the one, and wholly suppressing the other, which were Constantine's second and best Thoughts, and his settled Judgment after mature deliberation?

Yet our Author still ridicules the Athanasian Doctrine, as a *Pushpin Controversie*, and says, *that Leonas reprimanded that party, with, Go and play the Fools at home.*

Leonas was an Arian, sent by Constantine the Arian Emperour, to awe the Council; nor did he bid them go and play the Fools at home, I find no such thing in the place quoted by the Doctor, viz. Socrates, l. 2. c. 23. But there is a full Character of this Leonas, in Soz. l. 4. c. 22. how that Acacius an Arian Bishop, held private Conference with him, and consulted for that Interest, but could not prevail; insomuch, that when both Parties were met in his Lodgings, and he found the Arian Party like to be baffled, he bid them in these words, ἀπάθετε καὶ ἐν

## The Naked Gospel.

21

ἢ ἐκκλῆσια φησὶν; which I think no good Man would translate, Go and play the Fools at home, *Socrates* l. 2. c. 40. which signifies only, Go and talk it out in the Church. *Leonas* supposing they would be more modest and reverent in that Holy Place, than in his House. But of this the Historian observes in the next chap. 42, That *Acacius* and *Eudoxius* made great advantage; For (says he) they perceiving the Indignation of the Emperour against *Macedonius*, and other Hereticks, deposed many of them, and advanced *Eudoxius* to the Bishoprick of *Constantinople*; for the contention was not so much for Religion, as for Preferment; the contending Parties having deposed each other, and *Acacius* and *Eudoxius* with their Party did especially endeavour to depose the adverse Party, and coined their New Creeds to that end, being so confident of the Emperour's Favour; and hence grew those various Confessions of some Councils under *Constantius*, whereof, p. 34. a. 4. the Doctor says; That *Socrates* reckoned no less than Nine, (not Nine Councils, but Confessions; of which the Historian gives this particular Account, (calling them a Labyrinth of Expositions). two of which were set forth at Antioch; a third by *Narcissus*, and some Bishops with him; the fourth by *Eudoxius*; three others at *Sirmium*, one of which was read at *Ariminum*; the eighth was that of *Acacius*, published at *Selucia*, which was the same that was published at *Constantinople*, with an Appendix, forbidding the use of the words *Substance* and *Hypostasis*.

Now all these were conceived and brought forth in a few Years together, under *Constantius*; and by the influence of that *Arian* Emperour, who made it his business to advance and propagate that Heresie: But what are these scuffles for Interest and Promotion, (which though favoured by an *Arian* Emperour, were not only strenuously opposed, but generally defeated) to the constant and unanimous Decrees of the four first General Councils, and many others of the Eastern Churches, and by all the Western or Latin Churches, who constantly asserted the Doctrine of the Trinity.

I cannot better compare these Alterations in Matters of Faith, which were made after the *Nicene* Council, than to the various Revolutions that hapned in this Kingdom, after the Dethroning of King *Charles I.* of blessed Memory; wherein the several Factions, as they got into Power, strove not so much for Religion, (which was always made the pretence) as for Interest and Advantage, to the overthrow both of a well-establish'd Government and Religion, which now, through the Blessing of God, are returned to their ancient Channels; and may they ever bear down all opposition, and run on without interruption to make glad the City of God.

E

I

I cannot omit one Remark more in this place, namely, how partial the Doctor is in relating the History of *Athanasius* and *Arius*. He summs up in few words, whatever *Philostorgus* and *Sandius* the *Arians* had suggested against *Athanasius*, How he was banished by the Council at *Tyre*, *Antioch*, *Sirmium* and *Ariminum*; but is ashamed to mention those Sham-Plots that were contrived against him, and retorted upon his adversaries, to their perpetual Infamy, as *Dr. Cave* and *Dr. Sherlock* have discovered; nor have we a word how at the Council of *Millan*, where the Catholics were forced to condemn *Athanasius*, *Constantius* drawing his Sword, and telling them, *That he himself accused Athanasius*, and ought to be believed, and banished such as would not consent to it. But as for *Arius* he pleads for him, as if he had been as much a Messenger sent from God as our Saviour in his opinion was; as much doth he speak in defence of *Arius*. That he was justified by such as had condemned him by the Emperor, and a Council at *Jerusalem*, p. 37. c. 2. And *Athanasius* threatened to be deposed, if he did not receive him into communion, though the Doctor confesseth he would not admit the word *Consubstantial* into his Creed. That the Eastern Bishops (but such as the Doctor says, p. 38. c. 2.) were generally *Arians*, took *Arius* his part against *Athanasius*, and condemn'd him in the Council of *Sardica*. But all this trouble was not occasioned upon the account of *Athanasius* his Faith, but the *Arian* perfidy, who falsely accused and maliciously condemned him. Wherefore it will be seasonable in this place to give you a short Account of what the most Authentick Historians have related; which you shall have presently.

In the third Proposition, he says, *That the Evangelists in setting down our Lord's Genealogy, do not satisfy, but amuse us; and professing to instruct us, do doubly disappoint us: first by deriving it from a wrong Father, and then by distracting us two several ways; which, he says, is a warning against searching after the Eternal Generation.* As supposing it to be needless, and therefore impossible to prove him derived from *David*, (though the Scripture calls him both *David's* Son, and *David's* Lord) he concludes it to be impossible to understand his Eternal Generation. And thus the knowledge both of the Generation of our Saviour as Man, as well as that as God, are both concluded to be impossible to be known, because they are above our Understandings. So that he first raiseth a doubt of our Saviour's Descent from *David*, according to the Flesh, that he may make that a ground of his Eternal Generation by the Father.

In the fourth Proposition he intimates, *That a Heathen might justify Polytheism, at the same rate as the Athanasian Fathers have done the Doctrine*



*Erine of the Trinity; and that the Papists may justify their no less beloved Mystery of Transubstantiation (as he calls it): and affirms, with them, That the Scripture is no less express for the one, than the other; and the Contradictions no less gross in the one, than the other. And then ridicules that learned and ingenuous Tract, which was lately Printed, to shew what better grounds the Doctrine of the Trinity hath in the Scripture, than that of Transubstantiation, for want of Argument to confute it: As if we could as easily apprehend the Nature of Things immaterial, and removed above our Reason, as well as our Sence, as we can of those corporeal Beings, such as the consecrated Hosts, which contradict both Reason and Sence.*

*In the Fifth Proposition he affirms, That the Questions concerning the Trinity were decided by no other Evidence, but of Imperial and Papal Authority.*

*The Pope would be much more obliged and grateful to him, than the Church of England, if he could prove the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome over all the Churches, and that in Matters of Faith, as ancient as Constantine.*

*In the Sixth, That there is danger of Blasphemy, in examining the silly Question, concerning the Eternity of the Godhead of Christ; and that we have no firm ground to go upon. But is not that Rule of Vincent Lirinensis, a good ground, Quod semper quod ubiq; quod ab omnibus: But in this he joyns with Smalcus, to call us Blasphemers, and Antichristians.*

*In the Seventh, That the only advantage of the Catholics, is long possession: That they have so handled matters, as to hide much, and varnish all. That the Sentence which determined the Controversie in the Council of Nice, was not by the Merit of the Cause, but the Interest of Parties.*

*Answer, Long possession of such Truths as have a good Foundation in the Scripture, is a Title beyond any that pretends against it; when the Universal Church hath in all Ages, (except only a short interruption, under one or two Arian Princes) judged the Doctrine against the Deity of our Saviour, as a destructive Heresie: If we may thank the Doctor for any thing, it is for granting us this long possession, even ever since the Gospel was first published.*

*In the Eighth Proposition he says, This long and mischievous Controversie was at last decided by Theodosius; who receiving his Instructions and Baptism from a Consubstantialist, required all his Subjects to conform to that Religion, which Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, from the beginning delivered to the Romans; and which at that time Damasus Bishop of Rome, and Peter of Alexandria held: and that Church only should be esteemed Catholic, which worshipped the Divine Trinity with equal Honour: and*

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

*those which held the contrary, should be called Hereticks, made infamous, and punished. (All this Constantine, and the Council of Nice had done long before.) He adds, Behold now the ground on which one of our Fundamental Articles of Faith is built. The meaning of this is, that it is an Imperial Imposition; to which we shall give an Answer anon.*

*Prop. 9. What more ridiculously silly, than to build so weighty a Doctrine upon implicate Faith in two Bishops, partial to their own Sees, whereof the one gave it Birth, the other Maintenance; and what more odious, than to prosecute as Hereticks and Malefactors, all such as should refuse to be so grossly imposed on?*

*Ans.* What can be more falsely said, than that this Doctrine hath no other Foundation than what this Author allows it? When it was confirm'd by that famous Council, not as their own Opinions only, but as the constant Doctrine of the Churches of God in former Ages, grounded on the Holy Scriptures; and therefore to reflect on it, as the first and most uncharitable Dispute that ever rent the Christian World, doth not become any Christian, much less a true Son of the Church of England. See p. 55. col. 1.

*In the 10th Proposition he affirms, That (on his Premises being considered) Men may be tempted (as it seems he hath been) to number the Athanasian, among the Roman Doctrines, and to leave it on the same level with the Arrian, equally unworthy of our Faith and Study.*

*It appears then, that our Doctor never studied this Doctrine, whereof he hath long been a Professor, so far, as to make it an Article of his Faith; and if his Pelagian Doctrines and Sermons concerning Original Sin; for which many learned Men have severely censured him; with which the University was so offended, as to oblige him to explain, by way of a Recantation; and of his Opinion of Turkish Devotion, and his Naked Gospel, were duly considered, the Considerator must be perwaded, that the Doctor had made the Socinian Doctrines his constant study, and never thought the Catholick Doctrines worthy of his Study or Faith; or that instead of not bestowing one days study in reading Socinian Writers, he had not bestowed so much time in reading the Articles or Liturgy of the Church of England.*

*In the 11th he saith, We cannot think it necessary to Salvation, that every private Christian, (and by the same reason, that no private Christian) should believe that as an Article of Faith, which the best Ages of the Church thought not worth knowing. Which in the Second Edition he thus expresseth: An Opinion which so many good and wise Men as lived within three hundred years after Christ, were so far from believing as matter of Faith, that they did not receive it as matter of certainty, nor perhaps of credibility.*

*Ans.*

*Answ.* St. John lived many Years after Christ, he not only received it, but asserted it throughout his Gospel and Epistles against *Ebion*, and *Cerintbus*. St. Ignatius calls them *Serpents*, that did deny it.

*Polycarp* called *Marcion*, The first begotten of the Devil, for believing the contrary; these, I trust, every true Son of the Church of England will acknowledge to have been good and wise Men.

But you shall hear anon of an Army of Martyrs that have sealed it with their Blood, and what a fruitful Seed of this saving Doctrine, the Blood of these Martyrs hath been in the Church of God.

That learned and seasonable Collection of Mr. *Bull's*, concerning the Judgment of the Fathers in the first 300 Years after our Saviour, shews abundantly, what was their belief concerning the Deity of our Saviour, which may silence the Dispute, and save the labour of any farther Collection; an account whereof, for my Country-mens sake, who either understand not the Latin Tongue, or cannot compass the Book, I shall present to my Reader, and refer the Learned to the Book itself, where they may find all their Testimonies vindicated, and irrefragably asserted, against the Objection of *Sandius*, *Petavius*, and other *Socinian* Authors, in their proper place.

In the Twelfth Proposition he insinuates, *That the Positions of the Athanasians seems to infer Polytheism*: and when they deny the consequence, he says, *They contradict the Rules of Reasoning; and that they do so, because they allow Reason no bearing in Mysteries of Faith; and that this cannot excuse them from being Hereticks in Religion or Logick.*

Whereas for the *Arrians* he pleads, *That they profess to believe of Christ whatever himself or his Apostles have spoken, and where-ever one expression seems to contradict another, they take such a course to reconcile them, as the Laws and Customs of all the World direct.* This shews plainly what Party he adheres to.

The Rule which he gives us for the justification of the *Arians* is this: *It is frequent for Rhetorick to exceed, but never to diminish the Grammatical Character of a Person, whose Honour the Writer professeth to advance; and therefore they think it more reasonable, that those expressions which exalt our Saviour's Person to an equality with the Father, should stoop to those which speak him inferiour; rather than those which speak him inferiour, should be strained up to those which speak him equal.*

As if Christ and his Apostles, which wrote the History of Christ, did not deal more faithfully in relating the truth concerning his Person, as being one and equal to the Father; than those Rhetoricians, who to advance the Doctrine of *Arius*, would depress him beneath himself, and leave him as Naked as the *New Gospel* doth, stripping him

of

of all those glorious Attributes that should support his Worship, and depriving the Church of that satisfaction which he made for it, when he redeemed it with his own most precious Blood; which by the *Sacnian* Doctor's is trampled under foot, and counted a vain thing. These Propositions will fall under our farther Consideration, of the several Chapters: To which I now proceed.

*Chap. 1.* He treats of the Gospel preached by our Saviour and his Apostles, as necessary to Salvation; the Character whereof, is either that of a Covenant, or a Message. Of the Gospel as a Covenant, he speaks as slightly as short, quoting only *Jer. 31. 33.* and *Heb. 8. 8.* and says, *It is delivered more succinctly, ch. 10. 17.* This Covenant he says, *Leans on the Law of Nature, which also keeps it firm in its place.* Thus the Covenant of Grace is confounded with the Law of Works, though the Apostle sets them in opposition: *We are not under the Law, but Grace.*

That Christ is the Foundation of the Evangelical Covenant, ratified and sealed by his Blood, the Scripture teacheth so plainly, that he that runs may read, Covenants were wont to be made by Sacrifice, as Dr. *Outrede* hath proved; and so was this Covenant, it was sealed in the Blood of the Son of God, without which there could be no remission. The Apostle calls him, the Surety of a better Covenant, and bringing in a better hope: the first Covenant was, *Do this, and live:* the second is, *He that believes, and is baptized, shall be saved:* And this Covenant, *Das quod Jubet*, it assists us in willing and doing what is required, *Heb. 8. 6.* 'Tis a better Covenant, established on better Promises. And *Heb. 8. 10.* and *Rom. 16.* This is my Covenant, I will put my Law into their hearts, and write them in their minds; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a People: and I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.

But he commends especially the Character of the Gospel as a Message, and so makes our Saviour only an eminent Prophet, that came to advance the Natural Religion a little higher than other Prophets had done; his design being no other than to advance Natural Religion to a higher perfection, by nobler Precepts and richer Promises, as he says. This is no more than what the Turks will grant in Honour of our Saviour.

But there is another Notion of the Gospel more common than the other two, though purposely omitted by the Doctor; which is, as we render it, the New Testament of our Saviour, who was not only (as *Socinus* saith) a Witness of that Testament, but the Testator himself; that Testament whereby Christ makes us Heirs of all that he hath

purchased for us; that Testament which was sealed by his Blood, and took effect by his Death and Resurrection for the Salvation of all that believe in him, and obey his Commandments; *Grotius* on the word *adhim*, makes it parallel with the Hebrew ברית, which he says is derived from ברא, signifying to kill or cut down.

But as he observes, the Gospel is not called *adhim*, a Covenant, in a strict sence, wherein two Parties do mutually Covenant, but *adhim*, (i.e.) the Will or Testament of a Superiour, who adds Rewards to the performance of his Will; and it is called, the New Testament, being a Covenant of Grace, not of Debt upon our Works, but Mercy upon our Faith: So that *Grotius* concludes, the most proper Notion of the Gospel, is that of a Testament, by which the Heir is obliged under certain Conditions, and by way of a Trust reposed in him; and he defines it to be the Will of Christ confirmed to us by his Death, whereby we have a Right to all his Promises, on performance of his Commandments.

But the Doctor carefully avoids any word that might imply the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction, and therefore as he wholly suppresseth that of a Testament, which hath its effect from the Death of the Testator, (as our Saviour often calls it, the New Testament in his Blood, *Luke* 22. 20. *1 Cor.* 11. 25.) so he slighteth that of a Covenant, as being wont to be confirmed by the Death of the Sacrifice (for in all Languages, *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*, as well as in *English*, to strike a Covenant, imported the Sanction of it, by shedding of Blood) and prefers the Notion of a *Message*, as if Christ had done no more for us than *Moses*, or any of the Prophets, (i.e.) only declared the Precepts of God, which is pure *Sochimianism*.

*Chap. 1. p. 1. Col. 2.* he says, *The design of the Gospel is no other, than the advancements of Primitive Natural Religion to a higher perfection: for which he alledgeth those words of St. John, 1 Joh. 1.3. These things we write unto you, that you may have fellowship with us, &c. The Patriarchs knew only the Father, but our Fellowship is with the Father and the Son; as therefore in the face of Jesus Christ we see more of the Father's goodness, so are we thereby obliged to higher strains of love to him, and one another, which is the sum of Natural Religion.* And again, *p. 2. Col. 1. The design of the Gospel is to exalt us to the highest perfection of the Natural Law, by making us perfect, as our Father which is in heaven is perfect: This is the Authentick General Test, (says he) whereby every Doctrine must be tried, that claimeth our entertainment as a Gospel-truth.* And thus he equalleth Moral Vertue with Cristian Faith, and teacheth *Pelagianism*; which makes the strength of Natural Endeavours sufficient to Salvation, without the special Grace of Christ, as if that were not necessary to humble us in.



in the sense of our Sins, to mortifie our Lusts, enlighten our Minds, subdue our perverse Wills, and purifie our Hearts; they may be good Moral Men that conform to the Rules of Reason, but no good Christians, unless they are assisted by the Grace of the Holy Spirit; they may have a form of Godliness, but not the power thereof.

He greatly extols Natural Religion, affirming, *That the Faith which the Gospel requires, had its Foundation in Natural Religion.*

Natural Faith, as he says, is proposed as the Mother of Evangelical, p. 14. c. 2. p. 14. Col. 2. I have proved, saith he, that Faith in God is a Duty of Natural Religion, a Moral Vertue, a participation of the Divine Nature in one of God's Attributes, his Justice to be valued as self-good, &c. P. 1. Col. 2. He makes the Law of Nature the Foundation on which the New Covenant so leaneth, as to be kept firm in its place. I fear that the Reason of his thus extolling Natural Religion, is, because that in its highest perfection it can attain only to the knowledge of the Unity of the Godhead, (though in the depraved State of Nature, Men generally worshipped many False, instead of the One true God) but this Natural Religion suits better with the design of Arius, than of the Gospel, and therefore the Author espouseth and magnifies it.

He adds, *That as Abraham is proposed as the Father of the faithful, Natural Faith is also proposed as the Mother of Evangelical.* Here therefore we must enquire, whether the Faith of Abraham were merely a Natural Faith, and he had no Revelations that begat and strengthened his Faith.

The Arians grant, that as our Saviour says, *Before Abraham was I am, that Christ was before the Creation of the World, the Lamb slain from the beginning, that by him the World was made;* yet the Doctor declareth his opinion, that the Patriarchs had the knowledge of God the Father only, but it is like that of *Abailardus*, contrary to the opinion of all other Doctors of the Church, and the tenor of the Scriptures; for how then is it said, that *Abraham* rejoiced to see my day, and saw it, the day of his Incarnation in *Isaac's* wonderful Conception, his Death and Resurrection in *Abraham's* readiness to sacrifice him, and God's delivering him from death, from whence *Abraham* received him in a Figure or Type of Christ, *Hebr. 11. 19.*

*Tertullian* thus expounds that place, *That as Christ being a man was after Abraham, so as God he was before Abraham, and as being a man he was the son of David, but as God he was David's Lord, as man he was born into the world, as God he made the world.* *Tertul. de Trinitat.*



## The Naked Gospel.

29

*Pag. 9. Col. 2. He takes occasion to mention the two great Institutions of our Saviour, viz. Baptism, and the Sacrament of his Body and Blood; these he calls Positive Rites, which he, (i.e.) Christ, appointed, thereby to ingage us to profess our selves his Disciples, and are not Parts of his Covenant, but Badges of his Followers, and Acknowledgments of our Homage to his Person. These Rituals, says he, we shall not neglect: yet I find not one word of the Eucharist; all that he says of Baptism is, Pag. 22. Col. 2. That the Design of Baptism, as he had said before, was an open Profession of Faith, in defiance to the World and all its Powers, forgetting what he had said before, on our Saviour's words, and Commission to his Disciples, whom he sent to baptize, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, not simply as he notes, he that believeth, but he that believeth and is baptized, and as the Apostle, Hebr. 6. reckoneth Baptism among the Fundamentals, so it hath the Characters which our Author requires in a Fundamental, viz. a Precept with a Promise annexed, shall be saved, yet he thinks it but a Ceremony and Badge of outward profession.*

*I cannot but take notice how the Doctor pretending to be an Advocate for Infant Baptism, turns Prevaricator, and instead of giving them a right to it, robs them of the benefits thereof; he says indeed, that the Church may upon small security from other sureties admit any Infant for a Member, (i.e.) of such a Society as do profess the Faith of Christ; and by his argument they may (as well omit as) admit the Baptism of Children; for, says he, since the Gospel is the established Religion, and the Profession of the very Parents maketh great odds against any danger of the contrary, the Church may, &c. So that the Profession of the Parents may supersede the small security of other Sureties, and if there be no other end of Baptism but to ingage Infants to the Profession of Faith in Christ, it may be omitted till they are adult, or if they should die before, they who are not baptized are in no worse condition, than they who are baptized.*

*And is not our Author deeply baptized into the Sentiments of the Socinians in all this, and become a Disciple of them, and the Antipedobaptists? A Son of the Church of England is taught, that Baptism is generally necessary to Salvation. That it is certain by God's Word, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved, in the Rubrick after Baptism; and in the Catechism, Baptism is defined to be an outward and visible Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof; and the benefit of it is this, That being by nature born in Sin and Children of Wrath, we are thereby made the Children of Grace; or as it is more largely*

F

ly

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

ly expressed, the baptized are made Members of Christ, Children of God, and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven. But the Socinians reason cannot apprehend how this can be.

As to the other Sacrament, one Egg is not better like another, than his Discourse of the Lord's Supper is with that of *Smalcus*, in the Doctor's Book called the *Constant Communicant*, which he that reads will find to be but a Comment on *Smalcus* his Text, who, as generally the Socinians do, teach that this Sacrament which they call a Rite, was instituted only for a Remembrance of the Death of Christ, not that we receive any new benefit by it, or that any thing is therein conveyed or sealed to us; and so the words of Consecration are interpreted by the Doctor, as by a Socinian, thus, (i.e.) *This whole action which is now doing is my Body which is given for you, (i. e.) signifies my giving myself to Death for your Salvation, so that ye ought always to commemorate my Death by this Rite or Ceremony.* And Socinus plainly denieth, that the Sacraments are strengtheners of our Faith, or seals whereby the Promises of God are confirmed to us, or the strength of heavenly Grace encreased.

The Doctor also calls the Sacraments Rites, makes the Lord's Supper only a Grace-cup, to be commended to one another after a Feast, and breaking some Bread prepared for that use; and therefore we need not dread to be constant Communicants, or to be precise in our Reverence at it, as if he would have us forbear kneeling, as the Socinians do, lest we should be thought to Adore. On a design to deny that there is the presence of Christ's Body or Blood in any sence, or that any Grace or Promise is thereby conveyed or sealed to us, these things are some of them obscurely, and some of them too plainly asserted in that Book.

One general Remark more, which I formerly mention'd is, That he often speaks of a *Divinity of Christ*, but never of his *Deity*, which is noted to be studiously done by the Socinians, that though they grant our Saviour a kind of *Divinity*, as a Man of God, yet will not honour him with the title of a *Deity*, as God and Man; wherein they deal with Christ as the Heathen dealt with their Hero's, as *Servius* notes on *Virgil*, *Deos vocabant perpetuos, Divos ex Hominibus factos*; or as we call our ancient Writers, *Divus Augustinus*. This is observed by *Cloppenburg* against *Smalcus*, that he allowed our Saviour to be *Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος*, a Partaker of the Divine Nature, which St. Peter speaks of 2 Pet. i. 4. which may be attributed to all holy Men. *Smalcus* placing in his Frontispiece the 9th Verse of Col. 2. keeps to this word, and thus renders it, *In Christ dwelt all the fulness of the Divinity bodily*: on which *Cloppenburg* observes, that with *Smalcus* the Deity and Divinity

Divinity do differ as much as Infinite and Finite. And it is to be feared, that the Doctor hath the same Notion, though not only our Translation, but *Pagnine* and *Arias Montanus* read, as we do, the Fulness of the Godhead, &c. for he still keeps to the word *Divinity*, when he speaks of Christ, as *Smalcius* did before him.

Another Remark is, his depraving the nature and necessity of Evangelical Faith, and setting Reason and Natural Religion above and against it.

Here, first, I remark how well the Doctor agrees with *Volkelius* in his Discourse of Faith, *There are, saith the Doctor, but two Articles of Faith at most, and sometime they are reduced to one, and either of them Faith and Repentance. There are, saith Volkelius, two general Precepts of the Gospel, Faith and Repentance, which are sometime joyned in one Precept, and sometime in distinct Precepts, De fide.* — And he mentions the same of the Gospel as our Doctor often doth, *That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.* But then *Volkelius* by this Faith means an effectual operative Faith, (which all that profess to believe both these Articles have not) and to which we appropriate Salvation; and therefore the Doctor's disputing in general of a *Notional Faith*, and a *Credulity*, as he calls it, and under that Notion condemns, is a Sophistical way of arguing, much worse than any that *Volkelius* himself is guilty of; for he discourseth of such a Faith as includes Repentance and Evangelical Obedience, not such as is the effect of Natural Reason, but of the Operation of the Spirit of Patefaction, as he calls it, but more plainly such as he describes from *St. Paul*, *1 Cor. 2. 14. The natural man (such as he saith are all that are destitute of the Divine Spirit) doth not understand the things of the spirit of God; and v. 9. Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor the mind conceived what things God hath prepared for them that love him, but God hath revealed them to us by his spirit, Spiritu Patificationis, l. 3. c. 14.* If these and other Opinions of *Volkelius* be compared with our Doctor's Natural Faith, it would appear to any impartial Reader, that the Doctor is the grosser *Socinian* of the two.

On this Subject he spends several Chapters, the Contents of the first is to shew, he says, *in what sense Faith justifies*; but indeed he shews that it doth not justify; and first he condemns it as the unhappy Occasion of the *Gnosticism* which so much troubled *St. Paul*, by corrupting the Disciples minds from the Simplicity of the Gospel, which is all he says; and he might as well charge good Laws with all the Villanies that are committed against them; for the Scripture had foretold *there must be Heresies, and there would be Schisms, and that men would walk af-*

ter their own lusts, and deny the Lord that bought them; though the Evangelical Faith do no more cause these than the Sun doth those Works of Darknes, which are committed in its light. To make amends for this, he says, 2ly, 'That it is so happy as to be honoured by our Lord and his Apostles as to be made the sole Condition of our Salvation. But after this he asks, p. 10. 'And now what need of Repentance, of running the Gantelope of Mortification, crossing our Appetites, and afflicting our Souls? As if the Doctrine of Faith did not include or presuppose Repentance, or as if any sort of Repentance were available without Faith, and as if the merit of good Works were a necessary and efficacious Ingredient to the Cause of Justification; for thus he joyns Justification by Works upon account of Natural Religion with Justification by Faith upon account of the Gospel. Hence in the 12th Page he makes a large Harangue, Col. 2. 'What are the great merits of Faith which may any way entitle it to so great a Reward as Everlasting Life? Whatever can pretend to worth, must make its claim good by shewing how it partaketh the Nature of God who is the first Good; but to be credulous is so far from the power of Divine Life, that it is a plain confession of Weakness, it is nothing else but leaning on another for want of knowledge of its own: *The simple believeth every word, but a wise man looketh well to his going,* said the wisest of all Men; and experience tells us, that Children and Dotards, Women and Fools, the Sick and Ignorant are most easie, and by how much any Man is wiser, by so much he is wiser that he be not imposed on. Had it any worth we should have heard of it in Moses and the Prophets, and the Philosophers would have allowed it a place among the Vertues; and the Old Testament mentions it but once or twice, and that not by way of Precept, but occasionally; and what reward can it possibly deserve, if I believe either I do it on good reason or not, if I see good reason for my belief, I cannot deserve reward, because no Man can choose but must necessarily believe as far as reason requires; if I believe without reason, then I am a Fool, and so far from deserving a reward, that I deserve blame; and if it seem hard to justify our Lord's wisdom in promising so great a reward to a performance that deserves none at all, it will appear no less so to justify his goodness in imposing such a Task no less difficult than worthless; for whereas no small part of the good Tidings of the Gospel is our Manumission from the Burden of Moses's Law, the Yoke of Christ will seem harder of the two; it is easier for a rich Man to sacrifice whole Hecatombs, when he hath Wealth enough to purchase them, than to pull out his Eyes; yet can a Man easier pull out the eye of his Body, than his Reason, which

' is not only the eye but the heart, for it is his very definition, with-  
' out which he cannot be a Man, it is God's Image; and the Apo-  
' stle exhorts us to put on the new Man, which is renewed in know-  
' ledge after the Image of him that created him: Now that God  
' should print his Image in our hearts, require us to renew it, yet  
' promise eternal Life for reward if we deface it, is a saying harder  
' to be believed, than all the Ceremonies of *Moses's* Law were to be  
' practised. This and more, says he, is objected against Faith in ge-  
' neral, and against what Faith, but in particular against that of the  
' Holy Trinity, and the Eternal Deity of Christ.

Now when the Doctor so industriously suggests all these Objecti-  
ons against Faith, and takes no care to dissolve them, he betrays that  
Cause which he would seem to defend, as it will appear in his fourth  
Chapter.

The Socinians affirm with our Doctor, *That nothing must be believed  
that cannot be apprehended and understood by Reason.* To this we say,  
that it is not contrary to any Principle of right Reason, that the E-  
ternal Creator and Law-giver, in revealing his will, should propose  
Articles to be assented to, upon his own Authority revealing them,  
though his Creatures cannot by their Reason apprehend how those  
Articles should be true: Divine Faith is grounded on a Divine Te-  
stimony as it is Divine, *Neque enim quia bonum est id circo auscultare de-*  
*bemus, sed quia Deus precepit;* For we do obey the Command not be-  
cause we judge it good, but because God commands it. And as St.  
*Augustin,* *Judicatur ad id quod possumus creditur ad quod non possumus;*  
How can the corrupt and finite reason of Man comprehend the Rea-  
sonableness of an Allwise and Infinite God. We allow to all Gover-  
nors some *Arcana Imperii*, which the Vulgar cannot judge of; and  
shall we not allow it to the only Wise God, the Governor of the  
World? is there nothing above the sphere of natural Reason? How  
then comes it to pass, that it is baffled in so many natural things? in  
Sympathies, and Antipathies, and Occult Qualities, the Effects where-  
of are demonstrated, but the Causes cannot be known; And shall  
Man presume by his short line of Reason, and Discourse, to fathom  
the deep things of God, which the Apostle says *are past finding out?*

Tertul. de  
Pœnitent.

When the Socinians say, (though it be contrary to Reason and Scrip-  
ture) *That Divine Worship must be given to a Creature,* (as they affirm  
Christ to be) why may not the same Scriptures be believed, when  
they tell us, that Christ is One, and equal with the Father, God o-  
ver all, &c. though Reason cannot apprehend how the Divine Es-  
sence can be communicated to more than one Person, yet is it good  
Logick, (though no Socinian Reason) that though the Divine Essence  
be



be singular, yet it may be predicated of more than One, without Multiplication or Division.

But are the *Socinians* the only Masters of Reason, that all Mankind must stand or fall at their Tribunal? Are they the Light of the World, and all Men else in Darknes? Yea, even Christ himself, who hath taught many things as contrary to their Doctrines, as Light is to Darknes; then we may say, that neither God is true, as well as that all Men are Lyars. The *Socinians* grant, *That the Man that makes Reason his Judge, ought to have divers necessary qualifications, as that his Reason be clear and uncorrupt, that the Person be of great Probity and Sincerity, free from Vice and prejudicate Opinions, well instructed and exercised in Human and Divine Knowledge, one that hath studied, discoursed, and meditated on the Things he doubts of, considering what is said pro and con by learned Men.* And when all these Things meet, one thing more is necessary, the Illumination and Assistance of the Spirit of God: And hath this Spirit and sound Reason forsaken the Universal Church in all Ages, and confined itself to the *Raccovian* Catechists? or is every private Man thus qualified? Are not the most, carnal, ignorant, or obstinate, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the Truth, being lead away with divers Lusts, which darken their Understandings, and cause them to imprison the Truth of God in Unrighteousness, and lean more to their own Understandings, than to the Revelation and Assistance of the Holy Spirit: I doubt not, but the *Socinians* will grant, that such Men are not fit Judges for themselves, or others, in Matters of Salvation; Who then shall judge for them? If they choose another, it will be probably one of whom they have such a good Opinion, as most inclined to their own Sentiments: And how are they assured that he is not tainted with some of the same Failings as himself is, he ought therefore to consider what the Church of GOD hath held in all Ages, what the most general Councils, after mature deliberation, have approved of; and above all, what is most consonant to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and make these his Rule, and then he will plainly see, how contrary the long approved Doctrines of Original Sin, and of Eternal Death, the Wages of Sin, the Necessity of Satisfaction to the Divine Justice, and in order thereto, the Incarnation of the Son of God, which are as clear in the Holy Scriptures, as the Sun in the Firmament are to his clouded and carnal Reason; we may not wonder, that there are in all Ages Men of perverse Minds, &c. because we have been foretold, there should be such; or that the Sophistry of such Men, may raise prejudices against the most evident Truths, even against



against the Being of a Deity, and the first Principles of any Religion ; but for any who hold the Scriptures to be the *Word of God*, and yet deny the Fundamentals of the Religion therein taught, and shine as the Sun, throughout one end to the other, is against Reason as well as Scripture ; what is more plain, than the Creation of the World by God, in *Gen. 1.* yet may an Atheist urge the same Reason by his Metaphorical Sense of that History, as the *Socinians* do, by their absurd Interpretation of that of *St. Job. 1.* and apply the particulars of the History of the Creation, to the Erection of the Jewish Pedagogy, and Polity by *Moses*, as the *Socinians* do the first Institution of the Christian Religion, to be the Sense of the Creation of the World by Christ, *Who was with God, and was that God by whom the World was made* ; as is most express, *Col. 1.* and *Heb. 1.* See the Bishop of Worcester against *Crellius*.

Whence is it that the Ancient Fathers and Modern Doctors have lost their Reason, and the *Socinians* found it, that they, as the *Chineses* say, are the eye of the World, *Quid est quod Velleius intelligere possit, contra non possit, as Cicero de Natura Deorum* : Sure they have as good Intellectuals, and as good helps to improve them, and have given as great Testimonies of their Probity, as any *Socinian* whatsoever ; their boast of Reason therefore may be checkt with that of *Lucan* of the *British* Druids : *Solis nosce Deos & Caeli numina vobis, aut Solis nescire datur.* *Socinus* grants, That we ought not to forsake the common and usual sense of the Scripture, (and apply a Metaphorical Sense) when the matter is capable of it : And if his Disciples would grant but one thing more, viz. that we ought not to wrest little words and particles, which may admit of various significations, contrary to their common import, to which the subject matter doth determine them, the Controversies between us and them would be soon decided ; for as the R. R. Bishop notes, concerning that great Point of the Satisfaction of Christ, (which is so obstinately denied) that it cannot be more clearly expressed by any Man, than it is in the Scripture ; and if any Company of Learned Men should purposely write of it, as the Apostles have done, the *Socinians* would find the like evasions from the Sense of the one, as they have to elude the other.

We say then, that no Man of sober Reason, assisted by the Illumination of the Word and Spirit of God, can dissent from the Revelations of the Gospel ; because first, it doth propose such things as are above the reach of human Reason, but not contrary to it ; for one Light may be greater than another, but not contrary to another ; and that Mind or Reason which is improved and elevated by the Light of Faith, beyond the Sphere of its natural activity, and is endowed with a spiritual understanding, doth not only believe those

Mysteries

Mysteries to be true, but also may perceive many Reasons for their credibility, which are hid from others that have not the same Opticks; such as he may infer from the Wisdom of God, who proposeth them, and from the Nature of the Things proposed. And if the *Socinians* talk of human Reason in the Concreate, (i. e.) such as yet remain in the natural and corrupted Man, of which *St. Paul* speaks, *1 Cor. 11. 14.* it cannot be expected that this should agree with the Gospel; for if to the eye of the body, many things appear otherwise than in truth they are, which Reason doth correct, as an Oar in the Water seems broken to the view of the eye, which Reason tells us is still strait and found; and Reason demonstrates the Sun to be more than Two hundred times greater than the Globe of the Earth, though to our sight it appear not above four or five Foot in diameter; Why may not the eye of Faith as much excel that of Reason, as that of Reason doth the corporeal sence? As for the Quotations of *Volkelius* from *Rom. 12. 1.* Of our reasonable service; it doth not prove, that Evangelical Worship, as prescribed, ought to be measured by human Reason; but implies, that such Worship is just and reasonable, as well as spiritual, in opposition to the carnal Worship under the Law; where Sheep and Doves were offered to God, which were unreasonable Creatures, and dead Sacrifices; whereas now we are to offer up ourselves a living Sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God; in which respect it is called a reasonable Service.

The *Platonists* were Masters of as much Natural Reason as the *Socinians*, and if they, on I know not what Tradition and Enquiry, did believe a plurality of Persons in the Godhead, it is strange, that the *Socinians* by the help of the Scripture, should not yield their assent.

The *Platonists* had no temptation nor interest to lead them to the Notion of a *λογος*, but perhaps some Tradition from the Jews, which their Reason judged probable.

*St. Basil*, on the words of *St. John 1. 1.* In the beginning was the word, says, I have known many that had not the knowledge of the Scripture, to magnifie this Truth. *St. Aug. l. 10. c. 29. de Civitate Dei*, speaks of a *Platonist*, that was wont to say, That the beginning of *St. John's Gospel*, (whom yet he counted a Barbarian) was worthy to be written in Letters of Gold, and preached in the greatest Congregations. That in many Books of the *Platonists*, mention was made of God, and his *λογος*, or Son, whom *Zenon* stiled, the Maker of the World: And *Numenius* calls God, *Creantis Dei Patrem*, The Father of that God that created the World. And what is yet more to be admired, some *Platonists* reckoned the Word, or Reason, the *λογος* to be in the be-

beginning, to be with God, and to be God, by whom was made whatever was made; that he descended into a Body, and put on Flesh, but even then manifested the Dignity of his Nature. Of these we may say, That they were, *Naturaliter Christiani*, as *Tertullian* doth. And they spake the same sense, though not with the same affection; for the *Platonists* speak of Three Principles, the First they call, the *Being*; the Second, *Reason*; the Third, the *Soul of the World*: The *Being* begets *Reason*, not by a Decree, or Act of Will, but by Nature, as Fire begets Heat and Light, and *Reason* produceth the *Soul of the World*. *Platinus* says, *The Father and Reason are One and the same Being coexistent, and not forsaking each other*. The *Enneads* wherein he speaks this, is entitled, *Concerning the Three Hypostases*. *Amelium*, another *Platonick*, says, according to that of *St. John*, *That Plato taught, That in the beginning was Reason, and Reason was with God, and was God, that she made all Things, and was the Light of Man*. *Justin Martyr* says, *That Christ was known in part to Socrates, under the Notion of Reason, which foretold things future; and taking the same Infirmities as we, hath instructed us by himself*. And that the *Opinions of Plato* are not very remote from those which we have of *Christ*, *St. Augustine* agrees with him, that changing a few Words and Sentences, they would become *Christians*, as some of the later *Platonicks* have done. And *Tertullian* says, *That when the Christians say, that God made the World by his Reason, they speak after the manner of the Sage Heathen*. *Tertul. Apology*.

Now if the *Heathen* saw so much, (by whatever means) as to give their assent to a plurality of *Hypostases*, or *Personalities* in the God-head, our *Master of Reason*, the *Socinians*, seem to contradict the wiser sort of *Philosophers*, as well as the generality of *Christians*, in their *Opinions*.

Those that write the *History of the Pagans in America*, do assure us, that among some of them, there are *Notions of the Trinity* still preserved; and it is supposed, that by *Tradition* from the *Ancient Jews and Chaldeans*, in whose *Cabala* there were some dark *Speeches* concerning the *Trinity*; which though they were careful not to make known to the *Heathen*, yet some *Notions of it* were entertained and spread abroad into the *World*.

Having shewn in what sense the *Ancient Greek Philosophers* understood the word *λογος*, it may very much confirm the sense of *St. John*, if it appear, that among the *Jews* the same signification was familiarly received; and this will appear from the *Targum*, where in *Expounding* the 110th *Psalms*, these words, *The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou, &c.* they read, *The Lord said to his Lord*: which *Targum* was

written about the same time when the Gospel of St. *John* was ; and *Philo*, who lived about the same time, calls the λογος, Ἀρχαγευς, or High-Priest, agreeably to what the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, speaking of our Saviour, says, chap. 4. 12. *For the word of God is quick and powerful : and to explain what he meant, he adds, Seeing therefore we have a great High Priest passed into the heavens, &c.*

In this sence the *Hellenists* used the word λογος. *Grotius* says, That the Ancient Jews and Christians teach, That when an Angel in the Old Testament is called *Jehova*, it was not a meer Angel, but *cui ad fuit* λογος : and such appearances we often read of in the Old Testament.

So that the Notion of the *Messiah* did pass among the *Jews*, for the Son of God, under the Name of the Word of God. The *Gnosticks* also, and *Cerintus*, used it in the same sence, which gave occasion to St. *John* to describe our Saviour by that Word which was left known in those days, and to assert the Divinity of our Saviour under that Word ; which he doth so effectually, that the *Socinians* finding they could not object against it, have thought on a New Exposition, and a New Creation made by this Word ; which as it hath no Foundation, being *ex nihilo*, so it resolves into nothing : but the Word of God shall endure for ever. And this is his Name, *The Word of God*, Rev. 19. So the *Syriack* Translators of St. *John's* Gospel gives it this Preface : *In the Name of our Lord, and of our God Jesus Christ* : and the like to the other Gospels and Epistles ; and they celebrate a Festival in commemoration of the Mother of God.

Because *Philo* was a Jew, and one well skilled in the *Greek*, as well as the *Hebrew* Idioms, which were in use about our Saviour's time, it is worth our observation, how he speaks of this λογος, he calls it, the *ὁ θεὸς λογος*, *The Word of God*, and the *Divine Word*, the *Idea of Ideas* ; and says, *That it is the beginning and end of the good pleasure of God ; that it abides with God ; that God had a power of Generation ; that the First-begotten is comprehended in the Mind only, Tractat. Allegor. Post sex dies* : and in the Treatise of the Modesty of Women, the first λογος is called, *The Eternal Character of God, and is God*.

Now these obscure Notions, which both Jews and Gentiles had of the Son of God, are by St. *John* more plainly delivered for the Instruction of all Men, and applied to the Person of our Saviour, to convince us, that he is the true λογος, or Word, and that this Word is God ; *that God that was made Flesh, and dwelt among Men ; and that they beheld his Glory, the Glory of the only begotten Son of God, full of Grace and Truth* : And the Jews in our Saviour's time concluded, That Christ calling himself the Son of God, made himself equal.

When

When our Saviour requires our belief of such Propositions as exceed our understanding, it is a contempt and undervaluing of his Authority and Veracity, to expect Demonstrations for them. The Notion of a Christian, is one that believes in Christ; and St. *August. Serm. de Tempore*, 189, speaks of Adult Persons that were Baptized, saying, *I am now one of the Faithful, and believe what I cannot comprehend.* And St. *Basil de S. S. c. 7.* *I testifie*, saith he, *to all that profess Christ, and yet deny him to be God, that Christ shall profit them nothing.* What Philosopher knows the Nature and Motions of his own Soul, how it informs the Body, and is *Tota in toto & tota in qualibet parte*: or by what Ligaments it is united to the Body, and shall we presume not to believe the Union of the Godhead to the Manhood, and other Revelations of the Gospel, because our Reason cannot demonstrate how these things can be: *Si potes Cape si non potes Crede*, saith St. *August. Tract. in John 35.* *The way to get a right understanding in spiritual things, is to believe and practice them.* 'Tis not, we know and believe in Matters of our Salvation; but we believe, and are sure, as the Original is.

*Joh. 6. 69.* Believe that thou mayst understand, saith St. *Aug. on St. John, Tract. 29.* *If ye believe not that I am he*, saith our Saviour, (*i. e.*) *he that said, Joh. 8. 16. I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me; I, whom if you had known, you should have known the Father also, v. 19. I that came to die for your sins. If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.* It is well, saith an ingenious Commentator, that he said not, *Except you know that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.*

*Tu rationare ego miror tu disputa ego Credam*, saith St. *Augustine*: Do you reason, I admire; do you dispute, I will believe. And what was that he would believe, *Ipse Deus tria est, & unum quodq; horum trium Deus est, & Omnia tria non Dii sed Deus est*, (*i. e.*) God is Three, and each of these Three is God, and all Three are not many, but One God.

*Tertullian* was a Person of as profound Reason as any Socinian, yet he submitted it to Revelation: *Natus est Dei Filius non pudet quia pudendum mortuus est Dei Filius, prorsus Credibile quia ineptum certum est quia impossibile.* And *Christianorum est Deum mortuum credere contra Marcion*, l. 2. n. 41.

When in the Primitive Times Adult Persons were baptized, they were question'd thus, *Credis in Deum Patrem*: the answer was, *Credo*: and so *Credis in Deum filium*, & *Credis in Deum Spiritum Sanctam*. And hence they were called, The Faithful. St. *Ambrose de Sacrament.* l. 2. c. 7. 1.



*An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,*

The Doctor adds, *And if we descend to particulars in the Doctrines that are imposed as Articles of Faith, the more Objections will rise in force and number.* By the way, it is necessary to consider of what sort of Faith and Articles thereof he speaks; if of an *Antinomian* Faith, as separated from new Obedience, and such Articles as are the Inventions and Impositions of Men, then the Doctor acts impertinently, and fights his own Shadow, which he would ill resent. His following Discourse will evidence what Faith he speaks of, for p. 13. col. 2. *It is, says he, an acknowledged foundation in all Sciences, that we must seek Truth by application of generals to particulars; and it is the general scope of the Gospel, to advance Natural Religion.* 'Tis then the Faith of the Gospel which he treats of, under his Notion of advancing Natural Religion; and the sting of the Objection he says is this, *That Faith hath no place among Vertues, but Credulity hath one among Vices.* So that the truth of Evangelical Precepts and Revelations must be sought and approved by application of the Generals in Natural Religion.

The Objection which he says hath a Sting, p. 13. Col. 2. is this, *That Faith hath no place among Vertues, but Credulity hath among Vices:* The Doctor well knows, that the Faith we of the Church of England do profess, is such a Faith, as for the Objects of it, is contained in the Creeds, which we receive, and such as for the nature of it, doth work by Love, and doth both purifie the heart and makes the Believer fruitful in every good Work; a Faith that keeps us humble and holy, not presuming to be justified by the merit of any Works of our own, but through the Satisfaction made by Christ, for which God will accept us and our sincere Obedience, not imputing our Sins to us: Moreover, we acknowledge this Faith to be the Gift and the Work of God in us, as *Job. 6. 28.* and *St. Paul, To you it is given not only to believe, but to suffer;* And *Phil. 1. 29. By faith ye are saved, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God,* *Ephes. 2. 8.*

This is the Faith which he would make as Naked as his Gospel; as if it were an effect of natural Reason as the *Pelagians* hold, and wholly in our power, without any operation of the Spirit of Christ; without whom we can do nothing, as to obtaining of the Grace of Faith, or bringing forth the Fruits of Holiness: If this be the Faith which he opposeth, a belief of the Holy Trinity, the Redemption of Mankind by the Eternal Son of God, the Operation of the Holy Spirit in our Sanctification, as it clearly appears, he leaves all Christians in a State of Nature, without any remedy by the Fountain of Grace, of whose Fulness we have all received grace for grace.

In this Chapter, Page 14. the Doctor mentioning that Scripture, *Rom. 4. ult. Christ was delivered for our offences, and raised again for*



for our justification, he says, *That though the same particle sita be used in both places, yet the Apostle meant not to use it in the same sence in both; the sence of it in the former is contrary to the later; we rejoyce that our Sins are taken away by his Death, but are sorry to have our Justification taken away by his Resurrection; we are justified by his Blood, because thereby our Sins are blotted out, but we are justified by his Resurrection, because thereon our Faith is built.* The inference which he makes is this, *So plain it is, that the Faith which the Gospel requireth had its foundation in Natural Religion.* We see here how hard the Doctor strains to advance his Natural or Pelagian Religion, he will not admit that the Apostle spake sence, but contradictions in the same Period; he speaks our sence (not his own) in the first part, (*viz.*) that Christ died in our stead, and we are justified by his Blood, because thereby our Sins are blotted out; but he speaks his own sence in the other part, because he grounds our Justification on his Natural Religion, and thereby evidently destroyeth the Evangelical Faith, which we assert, (*viz.*) That Christ by his Death made an Expiation or Satisfaction for our Sins.

In this the Doctor Yoaks himself with the Socinians; for so *Crellius* speaking of the Propositions *διὰ τῆς & μὴ*, says, *They do not always signify a meritorious Cause, but only a final, C. 1. Sect. 6. (i. e.) That he died for the good of Mankind, as St. Paul is said to suffer for the Church; and we are to lay down our lives for the brethren, Col. 1. 24. 1 John 3. 16.* But can this be the sence of those plain places, *1 Pet. 3. 18. Christ hath suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust; and 2 Cor. 5. 14. He gave himself a ransom for all, and to taste death for every man; and Luke 22. 19, 20. This is my blood which was shed for you; and Mat. 20. 28. The son of man gave his life a ransom for many?* And ought we not to interpret this of *Rom. 4.* by the Analogy of those other places wherein the Scriptures do abound, as *Col. 1. Eph. 1. 1 Tim. 2. Heb. 7. 27. 1 Job. 1. 7. Revel. 1. 5.* against all these Socinus urgeth, that in *1 King. 14. 16.* where it is said, *God shall deliver up Israel for the sins of Jeroboam, who did sin, and who made Israel to sin;* where he contends that the same signification of the words for the sins of Jeroboam, ought to be interpreted, as we do interpret that of *Rom. 4.* which would be a kind of Blasphemy to say, *That Christ was delivered for our sins, because not only we had sinned, but had made him to sin, as Jeroboam made Israel to sin.*

*Chap. 3.* He applauds that Faith which is a Duty in Natural Religion, *It is, saith he, a Cardinal Vertue, Justice towards God that pays him his due; this was taught before Moses brought the positive Law into the World, and that the Gospel builds on that foundation, read Rom. 4.* This speaks of the Faith of *Abraham*, which hath been already considered.

Another

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entitled,

Another Commendation of Natural Faith is, *That it is a great Promoter of Obedience; wherein the Old Testament being silent, as he says, he sends us to Heb. 11. in the New Testament, But had not those worthies any notice of the promised seed? Had they no knowledge of a future state? Did not they look for a heavenly country? v. 16. And for a city which had foundations? v. 10.*

*Did not Abraham receive his Isaac in a type? v. 19. Did not Moses see him who is invisible, and had respect to the recompence of reward? v. 26, 27. Did not he write of Christ? Did not the rest suffer in confidence of a better resurrection? And did natural Faith instruct and enable them so to do and suffer all these things?*

If all these were the fruits and effects of a Natural Faith, I cannot see what need there was of the Gospel; if Nature shewed the way to Life and Immortality, which 2 Tim. 1. 10. says *was brought to light by the Gospel*; if it taught so much Obedience, Constancy, and Patience, how can Christ say, *I am the way the truth and the life; and no man comes to the Father but by me?* How is it said, *That grace and truth came by Jesus Christ*, in opposition to what was revealed by Moses? John 1. 17. *The law was weak*, Rom. 8. 3. *through the flesh, and what that could not do, God did by sending his own Son, &c.* and made nothing perfect but the bringing in of a better hope, Heb. 7. 19. This it seems the Doctor would teach the Apostle, for Gal. 3. 3. This I would learn of you, Received you the Spirit by the Works of the Law, or by the hearing of Faith? was this hearing of Faith the voice of Nature, or the preaching of the Gospel? It was the knowledge of Christ crucified, which the Apostle so valued, that he accounted all other vaine and ineffectual to Salvation.

John 14. 6

P. 63. c. 1. And as our Author says, *What Devotion is there without Love, and what Love without some knowledge of the Object*: And doubtless the more excellent the Object is, the more will our love be increased, when we consider that he who first loved us, was the Eternal Son of God, and that he so loved us as to die for us, that we might live to and with him; this will heighten our love to him above all things; for what are Moses and the Prophets, or the Apostles, were they crucified for us? have they redeemed us from the wrath of God? They indeed taught us the will of God, and gave us Divine as well as Moral Precepts; but Christ only can write them in our hearts, he only can pardon our sins, having obtained Remission at the expence of his own Blood: We therefore joyn with the Doctor in recommending the Duties of Natural Religion, and say these ought we to do, but by no means to leave the Duties of Evangelical Faith undone or disbelieved, for though that hath done virtuously in many respects, yet this excelleth them all.

In

In Chap. 4. he strikes again at the Foundation of Faith, under the name of *Credulity*, which he calls a Vice, and the danger in this is, *when we pay that to a \* Creature which is due to God only*; and mention-  
eth a Question of Mr. Chillingworth's to the Romanists, *Why implicit Faith in our Lord might not as well avail for Justification, as implicit Faith in the Church?* By implicit Faith in the Church, the Romanists mean to believe as the Church believes; yet I do not believe the Papists think this implicit Faith will justify them without good Works: And if by implicit Faith in Christ he means only a general belief of his Doctrines, without obedience to his Commands, neither is this available for Justification; so that it was no such difficult Question, but it might be answered. Our Doctor mentions it for another reason, *viz.* how any Church dare challenge, or any Man dares pay that Faith to any, yea, all the Creatures in Heaven and Earth, which is due to God only. And on the Socinian and Arian supposition, that Christ is a Creature, there is no more Faith or Obedience due to him, than to other Messengers of God, but we must seek for Salvation by a Natural Religion, and then, blind as we are by Nature, and having but blind Guides, we may soon fall into the Ditch; *For the natural man perceiveth not the things of the spirit; flesh and blood cannot reveal them, nor can any man say that Jesus is the Christ, but by the Holy Ghost*: That this seems to be the Socinian sense of the Author, is probable from the following words, *Those who require implicit Faith on any other authority, so as to contradict reason, give God the lye, making him contradict himself*; for Reason is no less the word of God, than is the Scripture: So that if the Doctrines of the Gospel contradict the Reason of Arians and Socinians, they are not to be received; for therefore only are we to believe the Scripture, because we are by plain Reason convinced that it is the Word of God: But what if some Socinians be tainted with Quakerism, and their Reason tells them, the Gospel is not the Word of God, but that Word is written in their Hearts, and the Light within them is the only Word of God, and not the Word incarnate, or that which is written with Pen and Inke: that is in our Doctor's Opinion the Natural Religion; for though the evidence we have, that what is offered us for the Word of God, is really such, to this we must pay neither more nor less belief than Reason will prove due, p. 18. col. 2.

P. 19. c. 2. The Doctor speaking of Belief, says thus: *The same Natural Religion which claimed it as due to God, forbade to pay it to any Creature, upon the former account there was no need of an express Precept, and upon the later there was the greatest need, not only of an express Command, but such repeated Importunities as might out voice both Reason when it should de-*

\* Doth not this insinuate that Christ is a Creature?

*An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,*

*cry such a Command, and Interest when it should rebel against convinced Reason; both whereof concurred against the belief which our Lord required. The sence of this Paragraph seems to be this, That as the Faith which Natural Religion claims as due to God, needed no exprefs Precept; so Natural Religion forbidding to pay Faith to any Creature, there was the greatest need not only of an exprefs Command, but repeated Importunities to pay it to Christ, such as might out-voice both Reason and Interest, seeing they both concurred against the belief which our Lord required: I wish the Doctor would give a more rational inference from these words then this, that both Natural Religion, Reason and Interest do forbid to pay Faith to Christ, as forbidding to pay it to a Creature; for he saith they concur against the belief which our Lord required.*

If the Doctor by implicit Faith means more particularly a readines to believe, as Articles of Faith, and as necessary to Salvation, whatever Propositions are imposed on him by his Superiors, he well knows we have no such Custom in the Church of England; we call no Man on Earth our Master or Law-giver in Matters of Faith. He that advanceth his own Reason (which is often against, and then it must be) above Scripture, he is in as bad a condition as the most bigotted Papist, for he makes himself and all his Faculties and Reasonings as Infallible as they believe the Pope to be.

*Chap. 5. The Contents of this Chapter is thus expreſſ'd: Why Faith under the Gospel maketh a greater figure than under the Law? This state of the Question he presently alters, and makes it his business to shew, That when our Saviour first claimed the publick profession of Faith in him, there were extraordinary reasons for his Importunity and Promises, some whereof in these days, when the Christian Religion hath been long established, have lost their influence, and by consequence the importunity of those Precepts, and the influence of those Promises do now cease. These extraordinary Reasons, (viz.) for professing Faith in Christ, he draws from, 1. The Difficulty; and 2. the Danger of professing Faith in Christ; and 3. the Necessity of it: All which, are readily granted, viz. That though it were both difficult and dangerous, yet it was necessary that the Disciples of Christ should publicly own Faith in him: but then the Inference which he makes is not conclusive, p. 23. col. 1. (viz.) Now that our Education makes it as difficult, and our Laws as dangerous to deny Christ, as it was then to confess him, and consequently what extraordinary merit Faith might draw from those Topicks, must now be lowered; and so Faith will appear a common Grace, worthy of no greater than common rewards. Is false, for (as he confesseth) though in extraordinary respects, that necessity be now abated, yet there is a permanent necessity*

ty from the influence which Faith alway hath on the action of Believers, because as he says, *The Christian is alway a Souldier, and must fight against all kinds of Enemies to Christ's Kingdom, not only Flesh and Blood, but spiritual Wickedness, and whatever would not have the Lord rule over them.* He must follow the Captain of his Salvation, who was made perfect by Sufferings; and when tempted he must walk in the steps of his Father *Abraham*, sacrifice his Lusts, though no less dear than was his *Isaac*: So that Faith must be habitually the same, and therefore needs the same encouragements now as it did when it was first required.

And I see no great need of that which he so carefully requires, that we must distinguish the times, for we are still under those later times which *St. Paul* calls *perillous*, wherein we shall meet with divers Tryals and Temptations, and therefore need the whole Armor of God, &c. And we still need the same degrees of Faith to overcome the World, (i. e.) *The lust of the Flesh, the lust of the Eyes, and the pride of Life.*

To this great Work he says Christ came furnished with no other power, but of working Miracles; but the Scripture tells us of other powers, for *St. John* says, *Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ*; He had the power to confer Grace, to give Repentance and Remission of Sins, to give Faith, and to increale it, to open the eyes of their Understandings, and turn them from Darkness unto Light, and from the power of Satan to God; without which powers that of working Miracles was insufficient; for we read of many that wrought Miracles in Christ's name, and yet had no saving Faith: and a Heathen may have a Natural Faith and Moral Vertues, and yet come short of Salvation.

He adds in the conclusion of this Chapter, *That if we believe him, (i. e.) Christ, to require Faith for any other reason than as it is necessary for our encouragement to Holiness, in order to Happiness, we dishonour him, because no other reason is worthy of his Majesty or Goodness.* This indeed is one great end, viz. our Salvation, in which the Glory of God and our Saviour are also concern'd; that as we believe in God we should also believe in Christ, and that all Men should honour the Son as they honour the Father, and the honour of the Son tends to the honour of the Father; therefore we need Faith in the Merits of Christ and his Intercession and Mediation to present our Prayers to God, and that we may come boldly to the Throne of Grace. John 5. 23.

Nor doth this derogate from the Glory due to God, for all tends to the Glory of God the Father; And he that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father. We cannot honour the Father more than by believing that he so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son John 5. 23.



*An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,*

to die for us; for the greater the Gift is, the greater is our Obligation to Gratitude and Obedience.

So that what the Doctor urgeth to the disparagement of Faith, *That the Precepts requiring Faith, and the Promises encouraging it, were calculated for those Primitive Times, and are now ceased,* is to recommend Infidelity and not Faith; and plain it is, that his chief design is, to exalt Natural Religion, on the Ruins of Christian Faith, which will also take off the Motives and Encouragements to Obedience and Thankfulness.

*Chap. 6.* In this Chapter he enquires what are those saving Truths to the belief whereof Eternal Life is promised; *These truths*, he says, *concern the Person in whom, or the Word which we believe on credit of the Person.* Here he enquires first, what kind of Person our Saviour requires us to believe him to be; this Person he describes from *7 Dan. 13.* *To be one to whom was given dominion and glory, and a kingdom that all nations and kingdoms should serve him:* The Title there given him is the *Son of Man*, which in the Jewish Idiom imports the eminence of the Subject spoken of; that is, a Man of some singular note, but a Man still. Another Idiom of the Jews for advancing a thing or Person, was to intitle it to God, as Rivers of God, and Mountains of God; so Man of God, and Son of God, by *Daniel* are made a Character of the greatest Beauty and Majesty, but a Creature still. He mentioneth also that Character which Christ assumed, *The only begotten Son of God*; these Characters speak him a Person of super-eminent and unmeasurable Greatness, like his Emblem the Light, and that is but a Creature; which whatever the Traveller believes it to be, still it is his faithful Guide: But have we no other benefit from the Sun but its light only? Doth it not also warm, comfort, and enliven us? Yet the Scriptures gives more noble operations to Faith, it is as much the life of the Soul, as the Soul is of the Body, it gives spirit and motion to every faculty of the Soul; so the Apostle *Gal. 2. 20.* *I live, yet not I but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.* But our Doctor frustrates this Grace of God, for if Righteousness come by the Law, then Christ is dead in vain; what good can the Light do to a Traveller that wants legs and life, or that is blind from his birth. As to his two Idioms, I only ask the Doctor, Why, when that Scripture calls Christ the *Son of Man*, it means a Man of Eminence and Perfection? So when it calls him the *Son of God*, doth it not mean a perfect and supreme God?

The Doctor objects from *John 10. 36.* that our Saviour spake nothing what he had been from Eternity, when, if ever, he ought to have



## The Naked Gospel.

47

have done it, but only what he was in relation to other Messengers of God.

*Smalcus* confesseth that in this Scripture, *John* 10. 36. Christ affirmed himself to be God; yet in his Answer to *Smiglecius*, he minceth the matter, and says, Christ did neither affirm nor deny himself to be God, for he doth not say, v. 30. *Say ye that I blaspheme, because I said I am God? but say ye that I blaspheme because I said I am the Son of God?* But *Smalcus* says, as the Doctor does, *That if Christ had been the very God, he ought to have expressly affirmed it.* See *Cloppenburg's Anti-Smalcius*, p. 309.

This of St. *John* being one of the best pieces of Armor wherein the *Socinians* put their trust, to defend themselves against all the Arguments for our Saviour's Deity, we must trie what Mettle it is made of; P. 28. *Col.* 1. he thus infers: 'That it seemeth plain, as by other Evidence, so by Christ's own words, that a practical Faith is all that our Saviour requires; for when the *Jews* came about him, and said, How long dost thou make us to doubt, if thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. And he in answer thereto called God his Father: They took up Stones to stone him, because (said they) thou being a Man makest thyself God. He did not on so urgent occasion assert his Right, but abating so much as exceeded their comprehension, satisfied himself (that he might satisfy them) with what might be sufficient for their Conviction to Salvation. Is it not written in your Law, I have said you are God's, &c. He speaketh nothing of what he had been from Eternity in himself, but what he was in relation to the World, and in comparison with all other Messengers of God, To them, says he, God sent his Word by their betters, but it is not sent to me by my betters, but by me to my inferiors: They were sent into the World the common way, and were afterward sanctified by receiving God's word. N. B. but I was first sanctified, and afterward sent, and if they who were less extraordinary were honoured with a higher Title, can it be Blasphemy in me, who am their Superior, if I take a meaner Title?

This Scripture is made the Corner-stone of all the *Socinian* Babel, which they endeavour with all their Art and Might to establish, and raise as a Tower of Defence against the Power of Heaven and Earth. The late Author of *Thoughts on Dr. Sherlock's Vindication of the Trinity*, makes it the Subject of his Letter, he says p. 3. c. 1. *That Christ brought in a sense of Union and Sanctification instead of a sense of Nature, (i. e.) a Socinian sense instead of an Orthodox.* And c. 2. *That the Orthodox, as they call themselves, can no way escape, because if Christ made use of the reason taken from his Sanctification, he has at the same time given*

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

away the former from the eternal Generation. P. 4. c. 1. he says, *That the other Passages which Dr. Sherlock alledgeth for Confirmation, (viz.) of the eternal Generation,* as that the Word was with God, (he omits that the Word was God) *that it was in the bosom of the Father, ought to be explained with respect to this express Declaration of the Saviour of the World; so that if he said he was the Son of God, it was because the Father had sanctified him, and sent him into the World; and according to this Passage I may (says he) lawfully explain any other Passage wherein Christ is called God, or Son of God, for they are all taken from the Economy or Ministry of Christ.*

We shall meet this Gentleman again anon, in the mean time we must not be uncivil to the Doctor, who hath been so civil as to grant, That Christ was first sanctified and afterward sent; whereas others were first sent into the World the common way, and afterward sanctified: To them God sent his Word by their Betters, but it is not sent to me by my Betters, but by me to my Inferiours. Now if Christ were first sanctified and then sent into the World, then he had a Being before he came into the World, and that Being must be as a Creator or a Creature, or a middle Nature, a made God as the *Arians* call him; the *Arians* say more, *That he was God's Instrument or Agent in creating the World;* which is so evident in the Scripture, that no Man of sence can deny, that diligently reads *John 1. Colos. 1. and Heb. 1.*

Now if God to qualify him for so great a Work as that of the Creation, did communicate to him the great Attributes of Divine Wisdom, Omnipotence and Omniscience, which are Infinite, why might he not communicate to him also that other Attribute of his Eternity in his Generation. But to come to the Doctor's Argument, viz. *That Christ spake nothing to the Jews of what he was from Eternity in himself, but what he was in relation to the World:* Doth not the Doctor grant he was first sanctified, and then sent into the World? And what is that Sanctification, but his being ordained by God to be the Redeemer and Saviour of the World? So *Crellius* says, *1. 1. sect. 2. c. 31.* To sanctify signifieth in Scripture to separate one, and choole him to a singular Office.

Now Christ by an everlasting Decree was set apart to be the Lamb slain, as an All-sufficient Sacrifice for the Sins of all Mankind: his Sanctification or Ordination to the Office of a Redeemer, was by that Decree of which the *Psalmist* gives us a Copy, *Psalm. 2. I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said to me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee;* which the ancient *Jews* affirm to be spoken of the *Messias*; And the *Hodie*, the day was from all Eternity; for the Redemption of Mankind could not be effected but by an Infinite Price, as Scripture teacheth.

The

The Argument urged by our Doctor, and the Socinians, is, *That our Saviour on so pressing an occasion ought to assert his Right, yet spake nothing of what he was from Eternity*: So Crellius, and our Doctor.

But we affirm, that our Saviour was not obliged so to do on this occasion, it was sufficient for him to clear himself from the Accusation of being a Blasphemer, which he doth by an Argument out of their own Law, which may be thus illustrated: The Doctor stiles himself, A true Son of the Church of *England*; to which it may be said, that he being an *Arian* or *Socinian*, doth blaspheme, (*i.e.*) speaks evil of the Church of *England*, in making himself, who is a *Socinian*, a true Son of that Church, which owns no such for her Sons, that are of that Belief. Now how will the Doctor vindicate himself from this Accusation? will he say, *I was baptized into the Faith of that Church, in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; I was for Twenty five Years a Professor of Divinity in that Church, a Rector of *Exeter-Colledge*. This would be an impertinent Argument; for there have been many of that Church which are gone from it, some to the Church of *Rome*, others to *Socinian* Conventicles: the most proper Argument would have been, to shew, that in our Law, the Articles of our Religion, our Litany and Homilies, the *Arrian* Religion, or *Socinian* Religion asserted; or that neither in his Writings or Sermons he hath affirmed any other Doctrine than what is established in that Church: for the Question is not, concerning the Dignity of his Person, or his Birth or Qualifications; but whether he be a true Son of that Church, and can shew the consonancy of his Faith to that of the Church of *England*. This was our Saviour's Argument to vindicate himself from the Jews Accusation, who accounted him a Blasphemer, in that he being a Man made himself the Son of God; he doth not argue from his being the Son of God, or from his doing such Works as no other Man did; but proves from their Law, wherein the Title of God is given to Men that were inferiour to him, *viz.* to Princes, Priests, and Prophets; he was not concern'd to tell them, whether he was the Son of God, by distinguishing between a Son of God by Nature, and a Son by Office; he doth not deny, but still asserts the first, both before *ver. 30. I and my Father are one*: and after *ver. 38. The Father is in me, and I in him*. And his being sanctified, and sent into the World, proves the same, (*viz.*) that he was the Son of God; for otherwise God sent not his Son, and sanctified him before he came into the World; but first sent him into the World, and then sanctified him to be his Son; which though contrary to what the Doctor grants from the Text; yet the *Socinians* generally deny, and ascribe his Sonship to his Birth, his Baptism, Unction, to his Office; his Resurre-

ction

tion and Exaltation, on any thing but his Eternal Generation, and Ordination, to be the Saviour and Redeemer of the World ; for which Office all the Angels of God were not sufficient.

And now we return to the thoughtful Gentleman :

This Gentleman thinks to thrust home this Argument to the Ruin of the Catholick Doctrine ; For, he says, *it is written with the Finger of Truth, and unanswerable*, p.3.col.2. *But that the Orthodox are wont to swallow all sorts of Contradictions, and to cast dust in the eyes of the simple.* This Reproach notwithstanding, we will go hand in hand with him, in search of that Truth, which this Scripture propounds ; for we are agreed, that our Saviour delivers his Doctrine in profound Wisdom, having regard to the Circumstances of Place, Time, and Person ; by these Particulars we shall examine the Text, laying down this general Observation, That St. *John* was desired by the Church of *Ephesus*, who were pestered with the Heresies of the *Gnosticks*, *Ebion*, and *Cerinthus*, who denied the Deity of the Son of God, and ascribed the Creation to certain *Aeones*, or Angels, denying it to be ascribed to Christ ; both which Errors he particularly refutes : 1. Then consider the Persons with whom he had to do in this Chapter, they were such as our Saviour had exasperated against himself, calling them Thieves and Robbers, that came to no other end, but to kill and destroy, whereas he came to give them Eternal Life ; which St. *John* 20. says, was the end of his Writing the Gospel : *That ye might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name.* This our Saviour proves, stiling himself the good Shepherd, that came to lay down his Life for his Sheep, (i. e.) all that should hear his Voice ; and that they might not doubt of his power to do it, he tells them, v. 18. *I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again :* And this he was to do by Commission or Commandment from his Father, *who loved him*, v. 17. As being of one will with his Father in this, v. 15. *As the Father knoweth me, even so know I my Father.* Again he proves his Divine Power by his Works, which were such as the Jews confest, the Devil himself could not do ; and to them he appeals, v. 37. *If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.* Now the same Divine Works in specie, argues the same Divine Power ; and therefore our Saviour tells them, *I and my Father are one :* that is, as the Jews themselves understood him, One in Essence as well as in Operation : the Jews on these Doctrines and Arguments of our Saviour, take up Stones to stone him, as guilty of Blasphemy, who being but a Man, made himself God ; for v. 36. as Christ himself saith, it was because he said, *I am the Son of God :* so that it seems, to be the Son of God, and to be God, were equivalent terms, and

## The Naked Gospel.

51

so understood by the Jews ; for by either of these they concluded, that he made himself equal with God. To silence the Jews Accusation he urgeth a Scripture which they own'd, being written in their Law, *Psal. 82. 6. Is it not written in your Law, I said ye are Gods : and the Argument is thus formed and applied, à majore ad minus.* If he called them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God ?

This his being the Son of God, he proves by another Argument, from the Works which he did, and they acknowledged that none but God could do ; therefore he argues thus: *He that doth the Works of God, and such as you grant none but God can do, he is God ; and ye ought to believe that he is in God, and God in him, v. 38.* That is, that they are of the same Nature and Essence ; and in this sense the Jews still understood him, for they still sought to take him and stone him. So that our Saviour still maintained his Doctrine, That he was the Son of God, in that sense which the Jews counted Blasphemy ; our Saviour doth not draw them off from their sense of his being the Son of God by Nature, to a sense of his being so only by Unction and Sanctification, (*i. e.*) to a Socinian instead of an Orthodox. But as the Gentleman observes, our Saviour answered them in profound Wisdom, with regard to the Circumstances of Place, Time; and Persons ; all which we shall now consider, and manifest our Saviour's Wisdom in respect of all these : 1. As to the Persons, they were resolved Enemies to the Life and Doctrine of our Saviour, and such as would not believe him, though he told them never so plainly, as our Saviour says, when they ask'd him the like ensnaring Question, *v. 25. If you be the Christ, tell us plainly.* Jesus answered them, *I told you, and ye believe me not, because you are not of my sheep.* Their present Honour and Interest was a barr to their belief : *How can ye believe that seek the honour that cometh of men, and not that which cometh of God ?* They understood not that plainer Parable in *v. 6.* of the true and false Shepherds. And our Saviour tells his Disciples, *Luke 8. v. 10. To you it is given to know the Mysteries of the Kingdom of God, but to others in parables, that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand.* These were those obstinate Jews, in whom was fulfilled the Prophecy of *Isai. 6. 9.* as St. Matthew relates, *ch. 13. 13.* for this cause probably our Saviour in his Wisdom thought it not fit to cast Pearls before Swine, he knew they would not believe, though he had asserted his Deity never so expressly.

2ly, As to the time, it was the Wisdom of our Saviour, not to expose himself to the Rage of the Jews, the Time designed for his Death, and



*An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,*

and the Manner of it, *viz.* by Crucifixion, not by Stoning, being not yet come; and he had many Doctrines to instruct his Disciples more perfectly in them; some they could not yet bear, and some they knew but imperfectly, even that of the Resurrection; and these things required his Presence with them for a longer time, and therefore he withdrew himself from them.

Unless this Gentleman will make himself wiser than his Maker, he must acknowledge, that when our Saviour answered those *Jews*, so as to silence their Accusation of Blasphemy, and stop their Rage who sought to stone him, though he did not by that Argument which he used, assert his Deity, (which yet he still maintained) that he used his profound Wisdom in the Argument which he urged.

But what if from this Scripture from which this Gentleman would prove, that Christ is called the Son of God by virtue of his Mission only, it shall appear, that he is the Son of God by Nature and Essence, may we not then retort, that he only casts a Mist on the eyes of the Simple, and hath a Spirit of Contradiction, if it shall appear, that the first Question was, Whether our Saviour was the Christ? as it is clear, *v. 24. (i. e.) the Messiah*. If 2dly, It appears that the *Messiah* was the Natural Son of God, then this Scripture from whence he makes the Objection, will be an utter Confutation of it.

Now this was the sense which the Jews had, (*viz.*) that Christ, or the *Messiah* was the Son of God, and they accused him of Blasphemy, because he whom they thought to be but a meer Man, made himself the *Messias*, that is, God; for they would by no means grant him to be the *Messiah*. That the *Messiah* was to be the Son of God, *R. Selemo* proves from the second *Psalms*, of which he says, our Fathers expounded this *Psalms*, concerning the *Messiah*, of whom it is said, *Kiss the Son lest he be angry, and thou art my Son*: which explains what is meant by the word Son, (*viz.*) that it could not agree with any other Interpretation, as that of, *Be ye instructed, or worship purely*: for the *Psalms* expounds himself; for it being said, *v. 7. Thou art my Son, viz.* he whom the Gentiles conspired against, it follows according to the interpretation of the same word, *כִּי, Kiss the Son lest he be angry*; and our Saviour applying this expression to himself, makes it beyond doubt. So they apply *Psal. 89. 26. He shall call me, thou art my Father, &c.* which also is applied to the *Messias*, and that God was his Father; and that the *Psalms* speaks of Christ, *St. Peter, Acts 4. 27.* puts beyond doubt; and that he was that Corner-stone, which these Builders refused, though there is not Salvation in any other, *verses 11, 12*. So that in the sense of the Jews, our Saviour making himself the *Messias*, and the Son of God, he made himself God, and did blaspheme.

## The Naked Gospel.

53

And now having proved, that this Author cannot by all his Art, wrest this Scripture to his *Socinian* sence, I hope he will be so civil as to grant us the same advantage as he challenged for himself; if Christ being the Son of God only by Mission, had been the genuine sence of St. *John* in this Chapter; namely, that as he would have all other Scriptures that speak of Christ as of God, and the Son of God, ought to be accommodated and understood in his *Socinian* sence, of being so only by Mission; so it being clear, that our Saviour calling himself the Son of God, made himself the Natural and Eternal Son of God, as the Jews understand and counted him a Blasphemer for it, he ought to grant that those other places which speak of our Saviour as God, and the Son of God, ought to be understood of his Eternal and Natural Generation: And thus it is evident, that there are some Men who can swallow Contradictions and Absurdities more gros than this Gentleman imputes to the Orthodox; for to give Divine Worship to one whom we acknowledge to be a meer Man, is a boldfac'd contradiction to the First Commandment, and to our Saviour's Command of worshipping the Lord God, and serving him only; whereas if we acknowledge One God only, and believe that this Supreme God subsists in Three Persons; this cannot be accounted a Contradiction, it is something above our apprehensions, through our ignorance of the Nature and Operations of the Supreme Deity, which cannot be fully known unto us, it is above our Reason, but not contrary to it; because it is agreeable to Divine Revelation, as the Harmony of the Old and New Testament, and the Reason and Judgment of the most and best Divines in all Ages have asserted. If a sober and learned Heathen should diligently read the Gospel of St. *John*, and find the words, God, and Son of God, so often ascribed to him, and such Divine Works done by him, and consider that St. *John* assisted by the Spirit of God, did write his Gospel on purpose to vindicate the Deity of our Saviour, which was denied by many Hereticks, he could not rationally conclude otherwise, than that he was the Natural and Essential Son of God.

*Bislerfeld* against *Crellius*, gives this sence of the controverted place, *Do ye not read that I the Messias said, ye are Gods, &c.* If they that were, such as they are described, *Psalm 82.* ignorant, v. 2, &c. Unjust, Oppressors, and ignorant Judges, were honoured with the Title of Gods, who yet must die like other Men, and the Scripture, which cannot lye, owns them for such, how can ye say, that I who am ordained to be the Judge of the whole Earth, and stand in the midst of the Congregations of such Gods, as an Almighty, and Omniscient Judge, to break in pieces, as with a Rod of Iron, all such unrighteous Magistrates as oppose themselves against me who

*am sanctified and appointed to be the Redeemer and Saviour of the World, that I blaspheme in saying, I am the Son of God?*

But I insist not on this, though it may have more of Argument in it than the Socinians can confute, it being said in the close of that Psalm 82. 8. *Arise O God, judge thou the earth; for thou shalt take all the heathen for thy inheritance: which is very applicable to our Saviour.*

The Doctor seems to grant, *That Christ was before he was sanctified and sent into the World.* Crellius grants, *That to sanctifie, in Scripture, signifies to separate one, and choose him for some singular Office, and to qualify him by special Gifts for the discharge of that Office; but this cannot be affirmed (says he) of him that is the most high God, such Sanctification and Mission belongs to Christ only in respect of his humane Nature.* To this Bisterfield answers, *That he must be a Stranger to the Scripture, that is ignorant who it was, and to what end Christ was sent into the World, both which will prove his Godhead, not barely from his Mission, but his Mission to that end for which he was pre-ordained, which none could effect but he that was God; the Work was too great for any, or all the Angels of God, much more for any one Man; he therefore that was sent to such an end, (viz.) the Redemption of the World, and Satisfaction to the Divine Justice, must be more excellent than Men or Angels, or the Mission had been in vain; therefore, as St. Peter says, We were redeemed by the precious blood of the Son of God, and by nothing else as a meritorious cause.*

Against this, Crellius objects, from John 17. 18. *As thou (O Father) hast sent me into the World, even so I have sent them (my Disciples) into the World.* And 1 John 4. 1. *Many false Prophets are gone out into the World, but neither of these were in Heaven before they were sent into the World, therefore neither was Christ.*

*Answer.* The word, *As*, doth not signifie a likeness in all respects, for then false Prophets, as he supposeth, (or else he urgeth the place to no purpose) were sent to the same end as Christ and his Apostles; it signifies only some particular likeness in the Mission; for Christ was sent by another, and for another end than the Apostles were; they were not sent to redeem the World by suffering in the stead, and for the sins of Men; but as Christ was sent into the World to perform this singular Office, so were the Apostles sent and qualified to do their Office, (i. e.) to publish those glad Tydings. Lastly, Whereas Crellius says, *That this Sanctification cannot pertain to the Divine, but Humane Nature of Christ only.*

The Answer is, *That this Sanctification being the Pre-ordination of Christ to that great Office, of a Mediator between God and Man, for the Sanctification and Salvation of his People, he is said to be sanctified,*

ctified, (*i. e.*) as *Cresslin* says, to be set apart and ordained by his Father for that Office, or to sanctify himself, by undertaking to accomplish it, and to that end by his Divine he sanctified his Humane Nature; the Sanctification of the Divine Nature was relative not absolute or internal, as if any new Vertue or Divinity were added to it, but the Sanctification of the Humane Nature was the Union of it to the Divine Nature, in respect of both which Natures Christ was qualified for that Great End and Office of a Mediator; and both the Sanctification and Mission of our Saviour were but a Manifestation of his being qualified both as God and Man for that great End of our Redemption. If our Saviour's Sanctification and Mission into the World, were a sufficient reason to convince the *Jews* that he was not a Blasphemer, in saying that he was *the Son of God*, why may it not be a sufficient Argument to prove that the *Socinians* blaspheme Christ, who say he was not the Son of God, until his Conception and Ascension into Heaven? Might not the *Jews* argue then as the *Socinians* now do, Why tell you us of your Sanctification and Mission, as if that made you the Son of God; if we could see you ascend into the Heavens, we might believe that you came down from Heaven, but till then we must believe our eyes rather than your words; we see you are a Man, and know your Mother and Brethren, and therefore you blaspheme in saying, *I am the Son of God*. The truth is, that Christ's Sanctification or Unction, his Mission, &c. were but as St. *Paul* speaks of his Resurrection, a Declaration only of what he was before.

Again, the Question was not in what respect he was the Son of God, but whether he was the Son of God, in any such manner as might excuse him by their Law from being a Blasphemer? and herein also he shews his Divine Wisdom, he argues from his Works and from their Law, which they knew to convince them of what they were ignorant of, if he should have proved that he was the Son of God, because God was his Father by eternal Generation, that had been to prove *ignotum per ignotum*; and the *Jews* would have equally rejected both, and adjudged him guilty of Blasphemy in the highest degree, as not believing that God had a Son begotten of him from Eternity, or that Christ was this Son, but they having heard of a *Messias*, whom they expected about that time to come into the World, the best means to convince them that he who did the Works of God, which no Man could do except God were with him, was that *Messias*; and if that he was first sanctified and then sent into the World, in a more eminent manner, and for higher Ends than any of those to whom the Word of God came in former times, to commissionate

them as Magistrates for the Government of Mankind, then he did not blaspheme in saying *I am the Christ*, or *I am the Son of God*.

So that if our Saviour's Argument were more opposite and convincing than those of the *Socinians*, we have gained this: Fortress from them, and on their surrender of this, their other little Sconces will fall into our hands; for whatever is spoken of our Saviour as God, or the Son of God, they refer to his Designation and Mission into the World, (*i. e.*) to his Humane Nature; as where it is said, *He received power from the Father; that he did the works of his Father; that he was one with the Father, by consent of his will.* And they will allow no such Phrases any way to imply his Deity, because those expressions of God's giving and Christ's receiving, God's sending and his being sent, imply a Superiority and Inferiority in the Persons, and that the one received somewhat which he had not before: But the Fathers and late Divines do easily answer all these, thus, To the Objection of Receiving, 'tis said, what Christ received of his Father, was not given as he was God, but Man. *St. Ambrose de Fide*, l. 3. n. 22. *Christ prayeth as the Son of Man, and obtains as the Son of God; he possesseth as the Son of God, what he prays for as the Son of Man: so he was anointed and grew in Grace, &c. not as God but Man.* *Perfectio non Deus sed caro; So the Father is greater than I, and the Father giveth life to the Son; and he received the Spirit without measure.* All such Phrases belonging to Christ as Man, as Christ says of himself, *All things are delivered to me of the Father*, as he was then incarnate.

The next most considerable Objection is from *1 Cor. 15. 24, &c.* *How Christ can be said to be that true God, it being there said he shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and then the Son himself shall be subject to him.*

*Ans.* This doth not imply an Annulling or Abdication of his own Dominion as God, no more than when God the Father is said to deliver all things to the Son, and *Matth. 28. 18.* *All power is given to me in heaven and earth; the Father did exclude himself by that Gift.* 2ly, This Kingdom is peculiarly his Church: and *St. Aug. de Trinitate*, l. 1. c. 8. n. 60. thus explains that place, *Tradere regnum est credentes perducere ad contemplationem Dei*: To present his Church pure and without spot, free from all impurity of Flesh and Spirit; from all Sins and all Enemies, which shall be trodden under their feet, as *Seneca's* Phrase is, *Reddam te tibi meliorem*; that whereas God was obeyed by them formerly but in part, now God shall be all in all.

And when it is said, *Christ shall reign till he hath put all his enemies under his feet*, it doth not imply that he shall reign no longer; but that he shall reign so long maugre all the Powers and Polity of the Gates of Hell, which shall not prevail against him; for the word *until* doth

not



not exclude the future time; as *Matth. 28. 28.* But how shall the Son himself then be subject? shall he become a subject of whose kingdom it was promised there should be no end, and that he should reign forever? *Luke 1.*

33. *Object.* Christ while on Earth, and now in Heaven, is subject to his Father; What other Subjection can be conceived, Then when he shall deliver up the Kingdom?

*Ans.* This by the Ancients was understood of the mystical Body of Christ, over which he is Head and King, and when the whole Church is subject, then Christ as the Head may be said to be subject; so *Athan. Contr. Apolon. n. 22.* and *St. Ambrose de Fide, l. 5. c. 6. n. 24.* Christ shall be subject in us who are not yet fully made subject. And *St. Aug. Q. 93. 69. n. 87.* it is spoken of Christ and his Members, *Christus universus est caput cum Membris.*

This Subjection is spoken in the future Tense, Then shall the Son be subject. Now *Gregory Nazian.* asks the question, *Annon nunc est subiectus est?* *Orat. 36.* Christ as Man never disobeyed or rebelled, but we that are Members of his Mystical Body do sin and disobey God and Christ; and till our mortal Body shall put on Immortality, we shall not be wholly brought into subjection; but when Christ shall have brought down all Authority and Power, subdued all his Enemies, purified all his Members, and presents them to his Father, as his Church and his Body, then the Son is said to be subject; not the Godhead of Christ, but the whole Church of Christ, which is the Head and Members, which then make one Christ.

It is the Mediatorial Kingdom that shall be delivered up, not his Everlasting Kingdom; he shall reign in the one, till he hath subdued all his Enemies, or of the other there shall be no end.

*P. 27. c. 1.* The Doctor restrains his Singularity of being the only begotten Son of God, to his being anointed before his coming into the World. And *p. 26. c. 2.* he says, That anointing was a Complement of the greatest Kindness and Honor that could be bestowed, on a Guest; and from that Office in Festivals was preferred to a Ceremony for enfeating Kings, Priests, and Prophets; and our Lord by it is character'd but indefinitely, whether Prophet, Priest, or King, or all. I persuade myself that the Doctor learnt this from *Crellius* on *Heb. 1. 9.* upon which he says, Our Saviour received an immense measure of the Holy Ghost, (but not as the Scripture says, without measure) but some degrees more than what other Messengers of God received.

*Chap. 7.* is to shew, That it is no more necessary that we should understand what the Person of Christ is, than for a Traveller to understand the Features of the Sun, &c. Which he says concerning Constantine's calling this

this Enquiry a *Silly Question*, hath been already considered; to which he adds, *That our Saviour could not require a belief of the whole truth concerning the Dignity of his Person; because the Gospel was preached to the Poor; And must they, says he, be excluded from the means of Redemption, because they are excluded from the means of understanding the Mysteries of his Incarnation? Must they perish for want of such a belief as is morally impossible for them to acquire?*

*Ans.* But is it morally impossible to believe what the Blessed Jesus hath revealed of himself? Indeed if the Traveller shut his eyes, he may walk in the Dark, though the Sun shine clearly on him: And is the Traveller benefited only by the light of the Sun? doth he owe nothing to the comfortable influence of it? Or the Poor to whom the Gospel belongs, are they only the Ignorant and Unbelievers? Christ tells us, *That the poor to whom the kingdom of heaven belongs, are the poor in spirit*; such are sensible that they are naturally blind, and miserable, and poor, and naked, not such as are rich and increased in Goods, and have need of nothing, as the *Laodiceans*, *Revel. 4. 17.* This is the Doctor's *Pelagian* sence, which hath led him into other gross Errors. The Poor in the Gospel are such as can submit their understanding to the Revelations of God; and though with the Blessed Virgin they doubt a while how these things can be true, yet they believe them to be true, on the Revelation; and this is that Humility and Lowliness for which she is commended; and this is the Power of the Gospel, *which is mighty through God to cast down the strongholds and imaginations of every one that exalts himself against the knowledge of God, and brings into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ, 2 Cor. 10. 4, 5, 6.*

Is it not necessary we should know him in whom we believe? Then is not the knowledge of God necessary? Is it not necessary to know him, on the knowledge of whom our Hope and Belief of Eternal Life is founded? Then it is not necessary to know, whether CHRIST or Mahomet were an Impostor, and if Mahomet have delivered as good Natural or Moral Precepts as our Saviour hath done; we may make him the Object of our Faith, and expect Eternal Life by Mahomet as well as by Christ: Therefore doubtless it is necessary to believe of Christ as St. Peter and St. Thomas did, *That he is the Son of the living God*; our Lord and our God, which Flesh and Blood hath not revealed to us; and on which Faith Christ hath promised to build his Church. They who saw his Miracles, and heard his Doctrine, confessed that God was with him: but in the Confessions of St. Peter and St. Thomas, there was something extraordinary which they believed of the Person of Christ.

P. 32. c. 1. *Two Evangelists*, says the Doctor, trace our Lord's Genealogy, but as they derive it not from his real but supposed Father, so they take two several ways, not to satisfy but amuse us.

The design of St. Matthew was, to shew that Christ descended from Abraham and David by Joseph's being of that Tribe, viz. of Juda, being the natural Son of Jacob; to which it is objected, That though Joseph were of that Tribe, yet Christ could not be so by descent from Joseph, who was not his natural Father; and by the Virgin Mary he could not be of the seed of David, she being of the Tribe of Levi, and not of Juda. Vossius recites the Opinion of some Ancients, who thought it was enough to entitle Mary to the Tribe of Juda, because she married into that Tribe; therefore he proves Mary to be of the same Tribe with Joseph, because Numb. 36. 6. *It was not lawful for a Virgin to marry out of her own Tribe.* Nor would Joseph, being a just Man, have taken one of another Tribe; and this practise of marrying in the same Tribe, was especially observed where the Virgin was an Heiress, that the Inheritance might be kept not only in the Tribe, but the Family; and therefore they usually married the next of kin; the Virgin therefore having no Brother, was married to Joseph, who was of near consanguinity with her. And he proves the same Descent of the Blessed Virgin from St. Luke's Genealogy, viz. from David; to which I refer the Reader.

See Vossius's Genealogy.

But if it be questioned, why if Joseph and Mary had been both descended from David, why St. Matthew had not named Mary rather than Joseph, who was only a supposed Father? To this he answers, 1. *Because the Husband was not to be bard of his Honour.* 2. *It was not the Custom of the Jews to derive the Genealogy from the Woman; and the Kinred of Joseph and Mary being well known, there was no necessity of mentioning it among the Jews, which dwelt in Palestine, to whom the Evangelist wrote.* And they were very curious in preserving their Genealogies: and it would much have prejudiced St. Matthew's Gospel, if undertaking to prove the Descent of Christ from David, he should have failed in that chief design, and in the beginning of the Book: and doubtless the Jews who were living at that time when he wrote, which was about forty Years after our Lord's Nativity, had their Genealogy preserved, and probably some of our Lord's Kinred then living; and they having seen his Miracles, by which they were induced to believe him to be the Son of God, knew also that he descended of David, according to the Flesh, as the Gospel teacheth; and there was no Objection made to the contrary, by Jews or the Pharisees, his greatest Enemies, who heard how he was honoured by the Name of the Son of David, and knew that the Messiah was to be of the Seed of David;

*vid*; the contrary whereof if they could have proved, it would have been their first and best Argument against our Saviour.

Now it is a prophane thing to think, that the Evangelists did undertake to prove what they were not able to perform, and that they should be guilty of such an Error, as the Doctor imputes to them, in the beginning of their Gospels, to amuse us with Uncertainties, and so draw an invincible Prejudice upon their Gospels.

That the whole Mystery of the Incarnation should be understood, was not necessary, but that it should be believed was so; and this was not impossible to the Poor, except upon the Socinian grounds, viz. *That we cannot believe what our reason cannot comprehend.*

The belief of the Virgin Mary, on the Message of the Angel, That she should conceive a Son that should be called, (*i. e.*) be the Son of God; for which the Angel pronounceth her Blessed. The belief of St. Peter, of Martha, St. Thomas, and the Eunuch, who believed Christ to be the Son of God, do shew that such a belief was not impossible, though they understood not the whole Mystery of the Incarnation: the Blessed Virgin did question, *How shall this be?* Luke 1. 34. she could not conceive the manner, but believed the Message; and v. 45. *Blessed is she that believeth.*

He quotes *Justin Martyr* in his Dialogue with *Triphon the Jew*, p. 31. c. 1. in these words, *Though I shall not prove, that Christ is God, otherwise than by proving, that this is the Christ, and that it was foretold that Christ should be such, (i. e.) by the Harmony of the Old and New Testament. Yet there are some among us (my Friends) who profess him to be the Christ, and affirm him to be a Man born of Men; with whom indeed I do not agree, nor will many speak so, who are of the same Opinion with me. By which words it is plain (saith the Doctor) that however the belief of Christ's Godhead was then most generally received, yet were not the otherwise-minded excluded from the benefit of his Redemption as Unbelievers.* How this Conclusion can be inferred from his saying, that he doth not agree with such, is not so plain to me; the right Inference from these words of *Justin Martyr* is, That the Godhead of Christ was generally received in his Age. What he adds, *That the Controversy hath gotten a new value, not from any new intrinsic Worth, but from the Price which it hath cost,* is an invidious Reflection on the Orthodox Christians, who were on the defensive Part, being, as he grants, in possession, and in all Ages suffered more vexation and cruelty from the *Arians*, *Donatists*, and other Sectaries that joyned with them, than from their Heathen Persecutors, whom yet the Doctor would accuse as the Authors of all that Confusion and Bloodshed, occasioned by the Heresies and Divisions of the *Arians* and *Donatists*.

This I suppose the Doctor knew so well, that he seems ashamed to retort, as he offered, p. 39. c. 1. *The Sentence of Theodosius of Heresy, Infamy, or Punishment.*

Chap. 8. is spent to prove, *That the Question concerning Christ's Godhead, was decided by no other Evidence but of Papal and Imperial Authority; whereas indeed it was determined by the first Christian Emperor, in the Council of Nice, wherein I agree with the Author, That if Authority must determine it, none is better than that of the Great Constantine; whose Decision you have heard before, and may more fully hereafter. Certain it is, that there was no Papal Authority when the Question was first determined.*

P. 33. The Doctor endeavours to expose *Athanasius* as saying, (in defence of the Trinity,) *That the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are as Bishop, Priest, and Deacon; but Bishop, Priest, and Deacon are divini, therefore so are Father, Son and Holy Ghost.* The words indeed are mentioned by *Athanasius*, but as the words of *Anomæus the Arian*, which *Athanasius* retorts upon him, for thus saith *Orthodox*: *He that owns the Coessentiality is a Christian, but he that thinks him to be no Christian who owns the Coessentiality, and yet owns it himself, condemns himself as that wicked Servant, by his own mouth. Anom. But where am I found to own it? Orth. You said, We think the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to be as Bishop, Priest and Deacon. Anom. I confess that I said so, as Bishop, Priest and Deacon. Orth. But Bishop, Priest and Deacon are Coessential, therefore you confess Father, Son and Holy Ghost to be Coessential.* It is evident then that *Athanasius* only takes advantage of his Adversary, by a necessary consequence from his own Argument. *Sandius* as learned a Person as the Doctor, is much more ingenuous, for p. 71. l. 1. he says, *Thus I do certainly think, the Arians to have taken this Comparison of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, with Bishop, Priest and Deacon, from Clemens Rom. and Ignatius, for so we read in Athan. Dialog. 1. de Trinit. And then repeats the same words, Thus some furious Men resolve to hurt their Adversaries through the sides of their own Friends. And all Men may perceive how irrational that Inference is, which immediately followeth in the Doctors Discourse, Might not a Heathen at this rate (saith he) justify Polytheism, &c.*

The Doctor represents *Athanasius* as a Man void both of Reason, Religion and Sence, p. 33. *Might not a Heathen (says he) justify Polytheism at the same rate, (viz.) as Athanasius doth the Trinity.* Thus the *Arians* represent all the *Nicene Fathers* as a company of stupid and ignorant Dunces; and the *Socinians* think the *Trinitarians* Idolaters and Blasphemers, void of common Reason; and in their sence, the Worship of God by our Liturgy, is in many parts counted Idolatry.



And if the Doctor had bestowed but as much time to read the *Arian* Controversy, as the *Socinian*, (which he says was not more than the space of one Day,) we should likely have had all the Sham-plots (which were so shamefully detected and exploded) against *Athanasius* revived, as some modern *Arians* have done: And in truth, their Slanders and false Reports are the best Weapons they have; hence it is, that they attempt for the Reputation of their Cause, to blast the Honour of the Great *Constantine*, as if he became an Apostate, and died an *Arian*. Which is as true, as the Fiction of the Heathen, *That he was a Leaper, and intended to make a Bath of the Blood of Christian Infants for his Cure*. Whereas *Eusebius*, who knew him intimately, doth testify, that at sixty Years old he was in perfect health, active, strong, and fit for Military Exercises, L. 4. c. 53. Nor hath any Heathen, however provoked by *Constantine*, through his Zeal for the Christian Religion, ever mentioned him to be an *Arian*: which had there been any truth in it, either *Julian*, *Marcellinus*, *Zosimus*, or some other Heathen that wrote his History, would have done; but we see some that call themselves Christians, dare to do what the Heathen abhor: And of this kind is that Calumny of *Sandius*, which I could not read without great wonder, *That Constantine the Great did never intirely believe the Unity of the Trinity*, L. 2. p. 186. for proof whereof, he produceth one *Benedictus Presbyter*, (who might be an Irish Priest for ought I know, or can judge by his evidence) his words are these, p. 159. l. 2. *Constantine was not wholly a Christian, but as (Tentator) one that would make trial, was baptized by Silvester in the name of the Trinity, but not confessing the Unity: And he was baptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia— And having obtained Victory, but lost his Sense, (Sensu alienatus) said, I will go to Nicomedia; where he was rebaptized, declining to the Opinion of the Arians*. Such a rambling inconsistent Evidence as this, is enough to draw a Prejudice against all the rest: I have not all the Records whereby to examine the other Witnesses which he doth produce to prove *Constantine* an *Arian*: *Orosius* whom he quotes, says nothing of it. *Sulpicius Severus*, l. 2. p. 138. says, *That by the two Arius's, the great Authors of the Arian Persidy, the Emperor was corrupted, and thinking to do a religious Office, he became a Persecutor; he banished the Bishops, delt severely with the Clergy and Laity that departed from the Communion of the Arians*. Now this being the first particular which this Witness mentioneth of *Constantine*, and for remedy whereof, he says, the *Nicene Council* was called, cannot be understood of *Constantine's* settled Judgment, or constant Practice, which is otherwise related by other Authentick Historians, and by himself, who says afterward, that the Emperor embraced the Decrees of the *Nicene Council*.

cil, which condemned the *Arians*, who thereby were calmed and joyned in Communion with the *Catholicks*. So that neither is this Witness consistent with himself, for he was a profess Enemy to the *Arians*, Who (he says) *not being able to overthrow the Faith by Argument, sought to destroy the Champions of it by suborning false Accusers, and feigning Faults where they could find none*; of which he gives Instances.

3ly, That *Opiatus* calls *Constantine* an Apostate, he only says, but quotes not the place, which is so much for his Cause, that I believe he would not have omitted it, if it were really so, for it would have weighed much more than that rabble of Quotations which he collects, as so many *St. Omers* Evidences, such as *Philostorgius* and his *Rhemenses*, and his *Anonymous Authors*; what *Socrates*, *Sozom.* *Evagr.* and other known Writers, especially *Eusebius Pamph.* have said, he durst not produce, though he useth their names: But he quotes at large the words of *St. Hierome Chron. ad Ann. 340.* That *Constantine at the end of his life was baptized by Eusebius Bishop of Nicomedia, declining to the Opinion of Arius: And (saith Sandius) here is no Evasian lest that it may be understood of Constantine the Son, &c.* Perhaps *Sandius* had read, that it was *Constantine* the Son that was baptized also at *Nicomedia*, as he may in *Marianus Scotus*, and certainly it was after his Death that the Persecution of the *Catholicks* begun, when *Constantinus* favoured the *Arians*. By the way I observe, that the first Witness *Benedictus* said, *Cessavit persecutio*; That on the Death of *Constantine* the Great, the Persecution ceased: which is contrary to what *St. Hierom* says, *That from the time of his Baptism the spoil of Churches, and Discord of the whole World was continued unto his days.* But there is more to be replied to *St. Hierome*, as first, He doth not say he was of the *Arian* Opinion, but declined to it; which was only a Conjecture of *St. Hierom's*, because he was baptized by *Euf. Nicod.* who was reputed an *Arian*. But as it is observed by *Ricberius*, a Doctor of *Sorbon*, p. 639. in his History of General Councils, That this *Eusebius* did not openly profess himself an *Arian* as long as *Constantine* lived, and the opposition that he made against *Athanasius* was pursued on other pretences; and that *Constantine* banished him upon a false Accusation, that he had intercepted the Customs which were to be sent him from *Alexandria* to *Constantinople*. And he was also so kind to *Arius* upon another false Suggestion, That he differed nothing from the *Nicene* Faith. Now *St. Hierom* hearing of these Actions of *Constantine*, and not being truly informed of the reasons of them, might conjecture that he inclined to the *Arian* Opinion; and why might he not be mistaken in his Relation of *Constantine*, as well as in that concerning *Meletius* (in the same Chronicle) whom he reports to be an Ene-

my of the Church ; and yet it is most certain, (saith *Richerius*) that none besides *Athanasius* did do, or suffer more for the Catholick Faith, as *St. Basil* in his Epistles, and *Greg. Naz.* who familiarly conversed with him have attested. Doubtless neither *Eusebius*, *Pampb.* nor *Athanasius*, nor the rest of the approved Catholick Writers, would have so recommended the Actions of *Constantine*, if he had been a known *Arian*, and for the sake of that Opinion had persecuted the Orthodox and Bishops ; such are the Weapons of **Naked Gospellers**, who licking themselves clean with their Tongues, are wont to spit out the Filth and Venome in Calumnies and Reproaches, in the face of their Adversaries ; hence *Athanasius* is represented as a Drunkard, and incontinent Person ; and the Fathers of the *Nicene* Council, as a company of rude, unexperienced, unlearned, and inconstant Men, and the great *Constantine*, who confirmed the *Nicene* Faith, suffereth as an *Arian* to this day. See *Sandius*, p. 167.

It is the Judgment of a very great Man, *Gothofred*, in his Notes on *Philostorgius*, That while *Constantine* was living, no Man durst open his mouth against the *Nicene* Creed ; and that those who followed *Eusebius*, did profess their assent to it, p. 62. And that *Eusebius* *Nicomediensis* and others of his Party in that Council, did subscribe to the same, p. 36. which *Theodoret* says, they did, that putting on the Sheep's skin, they might act the more like Wolves, *Theod. l. 1. c. 19*. As they did shortly after the Death of *Constantine*. And *Philostorgius* says, Some of them recanted while *Constantine* lived, and confessed, that they had done wickedly in subscribing to that Council, for fear of his displeasure, *Gothof. p. 43, 44*. And *Photius* observes it to be a Fiction of *Philostorgius*, That *Constantine* sometime after the *Nicene* Council, should send forth his Letters, condemning the word *homon* ; and that *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, should subscribe to the same ; of whom *Athanasius*, *Orat. contra Arianos*, p. 132. says, That he died firm in the *Nicene* Faith, about a Year after that Council, viz. Anno 326. And that *Constantine* dyed in the same Faith, besides the Testimony of *Athanasius* in his *Ad vitam Solitariam agentes*, *Epiph. Her. 69. Theod. l. 2. c. 5*. And *Lex 1. Cod. Theodof. contra Heretic.* do attest. See *Gothofrede*, p. 46.

*Chap. 8. p. 34.* The Doctor amuseth us with the variety of Creeds published by Councils, under the influence of the Emperor *Constantinus*, whereof I shall give the Reader this brief account. After that *Athanasius* fell under *Constantines* displeasure, and was banished, it is said, he never saw his face more ; though it is reported, that *Constantine* did it out of kindness to secure him from the Attempts of such as sought to take away his life ; and *Constantine* his Son declared as much, and that it was his Fathers mind to recal him ; and some say he would have

put it on his Will, had not *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* hindred it. *Athanasius* himself was of the same mind; and evident it is, that his Son *Constantine* recalled him soon after his Fathers death, and sent Letters to the people of *Alexandria* on his behalf. A Synod at *Alexandria* vindicate him, and write to *Julius* Bp of *Rome* on his behalf; but a Synod being met at *Antioch*, which had the favour of *Constantius*, they coyn new Creeds in opposition to the *Nicene* Faith; there are in Ecclesiastical History fower sorts, one is of a larger size, which hath this Preface, *We are not the disciples of Arius*; yet they consented to the Condemnation of *Athanasius*, who made his Appeal to *Julius* Bishop of *Rome*, who summoned the Eastern Bishops, intending a hearing of *Athanasius* his cause in a full Synod; but they refusing to come, the Synod acquitted *Athanasius*, and condemned *Photinus*. *Constantius* befriended *Athanasius* so far, as to write to his Brother *Constantius* on his behalf, not without threatening to restore him by Arms, if it were denied. They therefore agreed that there should be a general Council summoned at *Millan*, but that requiring a long time, there was a Synod held at *Sardica*, where the *Arrian* Party thought that *Athanasius* durst not appear; but he deceived them, and came so provided, that they thought not fit to revive their accusations against him; though a Party of the *Arrians* decreed to omit the word *ὁμολογῶν*, and without hearing, condemned *Julius* Bishop of *Rome*, *Hosius* of *Corduba*, and *Athanasius*. But the Council of *Sardica* confirmed the *Nicene* Faith, acquitted *Athanasius*, and found the *Arrian* Party guilty of divers Tumults, which had occasioned much shedding of blood; they Condemned *George*, who had intruded to the Bishoprick of *Alexandria*, as a person not worthy of the name of a Christian; and wrote their Letters to *Julius*, to confirm their Decree for the restoring of *Athanasius*, which was agreed to by more than Three Hundred Bishops; and sent Letters also to the people of *Alexandria* to receive their Bishop; and it hapning that *George* the Intruder, having been slain in a Tumult, *Constantius* himself fearing the consequence of such Tumults, wrote to the Citizens on the behalf of *Athanasius*. And thus that Church injoyed some respite, *Constantius* being employed in a War against *Magnentius*. In his March towards *Mursa*, where the Battle was fought, he made a stop at a Church under the Jurisdiction of *Valens* the *Arrian* Bishop, waiting the Success of the Battle; in which retirement *Valens* carest the Emperor, and as *Salpitiuss Severus* relates the matter, *Valens* had provided some Messengers to attend the Army, and as soon as they saw to which Party the Victory inclined, to bring him the News with all possible speed, designing that if the Emperour was overcome, he might secure himself by flight; if he conquered,

*Valens*

*Valens* might ingratiate himself, by giving the first Intelligence of a Victory, which accordingly fell out ; for *Magenius* was totally routed, and the News came when the Emperour seemed much dejected ; but on hearing of it by *Valence*, the Emperour could scarce believe it, demanding to speak with the Messenger : but *Valens* told him, *He might be confident of it, for it was revealed to him by an Angel* : and shortly after the Messenger entred to confirm the News of the Victory. This so ingratiated *Valens* with the Emperour, that he was wont to say, The Victory was owing more to the Merits of *Valens*, than to the Valour of his Army. *Sulp. Sever. l. 2. p. 143. Edit. Amstel. 1641.*

After this Battel, *Valens* having regain'd the good Opinion of the Emperour, which he had almost lost by his inconstancy, declaring sometimes for, and other times against the *Nicene* Faith. And now was a fit opportunity to mind the Emperour of his Promise for Summoning a General Council at *Millan*, the Emperour being then resident there ; and the Council being met, *Valens* pursues his design against *Athanasius*, requiring Subscriptions for his Condemnation ; but the Orthodox Party perceiving many *Arians* there, desired that Matters of Faith might have the precedency, and so propounded the *Nicene* Creed to be first subscribed ; which *Valens* opposing, it was cast in his teeth, *That he had formerly subscribed it more than once, and therefore it was hoped he would not refuse it now* : yet when *Dionisius* Bishop of *Mil-lan*, took his Pen ready to subscribe his Name, *Valens* snatcht it out of his hand, and bid him, *forbear, until Athanasius's Case was decided* ; and then was an *Arian* Creed read, and Subscriptions required thereunto ; which the Catholicks refused, and thereupon arose a great Tumult among the People ; insomuch, that the Emperour fearing the event, adjourned them to meet at his Court, where the Accusations against *Athanasius* being renewed, the Catholicks pleaded, that they had been adjudged to be false, (*viz.*) in the Synod at *Tyre*, Anno 335, where the Woman that was brought to accuse him for Incontinency, was convicted of a false Accusation ; for *Timotheus* who accompanied *Athanasius*, stood up, as if he had been *Athanasius*, and asked her, *Whether he ever used any force or other temptation to deprave her ?* which she confidently affirmed ; and thereupon that sham was detected.

So was the Second Accusation about the Death of *Arsenius*, who being deprived by *Athanasius*, and denied Communion with the Church at *Alexandria*, the *Arian* Party perswaded him to withdraw, and lie hid for a while ; and in the mean time they gave out, that *Athanasius* had been the cause of destroying him : but there were two suffi-



sufficient Witnesses produced to prove, that *Arsenius* was alive, and that they saw him lately in good health.

They accused him also of several other Crimes, but wanting sufficient Evidence, the Emperour being present, stood up and said, *That he himself accused Athanasius, and knew him to be a turbulent and seditious Person, and demanded who would refuse his Testimony.* *Liberius* Bishop of *Rome* was the first whose Subscription to the Condemnation of *Arbanasius* was required, who stoutly refused it, and argued against the Emperour, and others who urged it, and still refusing was banished by the Emperour; then *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba* was assaulted, sometime by Promises, and then by Threats, and being of great Age, and overcome by Reproaches, as if he alone withstood the Emperour's Pleasure, and the Church's Peace, and having suffered in his Body, as well as his good Name, at last, to save his Carcase, (as the Historians say) was prevailed with to subscribe; but returning home to *Spain*, *Arbanasius* says, that *Hosius* on his Death-bed repented, complaining of the Violences which were offered him, and anathematized the *Arians*, charging all the People to avoid that Heresie. *Arbanasius* gives him an excellent Character, and in allusion to his Name, says, *He was truly ὁσῖος, (i. e.) a Holy Man.*

Another Synod was made up by some of these Men at *Sirmium*, where they condemned as well the *ὑποκρίνον*, as the *εὐκρίνον*, as being not Scriptural words; and 'tis observed, that in their address to the Emperour, among other Titles which they gave him, they termed him *Eternal*, which they denied to grant to the Son of God, whom they affirmed to be a Creature. This Synod was held *Anno Dom.* 359.

But there needed yet a farther Confirmation of the *Arian* Doctrine, and therefore the Emperour is persuaded to send to the Bishop of *Rome*, to summon all the Bishops of the *Latine*, as the Emperour undertook for the Bishops of the *Greek* Church; and there was like to be so great a concourse, that one place was not thought capable to entertain them; wherefore *Ariminum* in *Italy* was appointed for the *Western*, and *Selucia* for the *Eastern* Bishops. Here *Valens* finding the *Nicene* Faith likely to be confirmed, read a Creed very like to that of the *Nicene*, one only expression being subtly inserted, (*viz.*) *That Christ was not a Creature like unto other Creatures*; and all the rest being agreeable to the *Nicene* Faith, they were unwarily prevailed with to sign that Creed, which implied our Saviour to be a Creature; the same after much Controversie was confirm'd at *Selucia*, by the means of *Leonas*, whom the Emperour sent there for that purpose. Some of the *Eastern* Bishops in their Return stayed at a place called *Nice*, in *Thracia*,

*Thracia*, where they confirmed the same Faith, thinking to recommend it to the common People under the name of the *Nicene Faith*. These were headed by *Ursacius*. And at *Antioch* some others met Anno. 360. and condemned the use of the word *Substance*, whence they were called *Anomæans* and *Euxouctians*. But about this time *Constantius* dies, (*viz.*) Anno 361, whose great business was to establish the *Arian Faith*, imploying the Bishops in one Synod after another, and influencing them all by his own Presence, or his Deputies, and his Threatning Letters. But on his Death-bed (it is said) he repented of these three things: 1. *That he had caused the Death of so many of his Kindred.* 2ly, *That he had named Julian to be his Successor in the Empire.* And 3ly, *That he had occasioned so many Troubles and Innovations in the Church and Faith.* See *Theoderet*, l. 3. c. 1. p. 125. But *Athanasius* survived him many Years, and died in a good old Age, having established the Foundation of the Christian Faith, and thereupon raised a perpetual Monument of his Learning and Piety, which shall be happily remembered in all Places where the Gospel is preached.

Chap. 9. He says, *The Dispute is dangerous, and the Danger is twofold, 1. Of Blasphemy. 2. Contention. 1. Concerning Blasphemy: They who held the unknown were thought to blaspheme, as denying that the Son had any substance of his own: The others were accused as Heathen that brought in the Worship of many Gods. And thus, he says, either Party charged the other with Blasphemy. As for the Arians, it may well be thought that they had their superior and inferior Gods, in that they worshipped a Created God; but the Consubstantialists worshipped one God only, (i. e.) the Trinity in Unity.*

There is no doubt a Blasphemy against the Son of God, when as the Pharisees that would have stoned him because he said he was the Son of God, thinking that he acted by the help of *Belzeebub* the Prince of Devils, and if they had only denied him to have wrought his Miracles by the Spirit of God, this had been a Blasphemy. An ancient Divine of our Church, Mr. Porter, writing of the Incarnation of our Saviour, gives his sense of *Matth. 12. 31, 32.* which I only repeat, and leave the Reader to judge of it, being alien from the common Interpretation, 'Christ having cast out a Devil by his Divine Spirit, the Pharisees knowing it must be done by some supernatural Power, would not grant it to be by the Power of God, but of the Devil; our Saviour convinceth them that it was done by the Spirit of God, though they would not acknowledge it, but against the Evidence of a Divine Power, blasphemed the Spirit by which our Saviour had done that Miracle.

They had reproached him as a Man before, calling him a *gluttonous Person, a Wine-bibber, a friend of Publicans and Sinners*: This was *remissus ventire de felio hominis*. But when they blaspheme the Spirit of God by which he had cast out a Devil, as if by consent of Devils he had cast them out: this he denounceth an unpardonable Sin, the Sin against the Holy Ghost, (*i. e.*) saith he, *Against the spirit of God in Christ, not taken personally, for the Holy Ghost, but essentially for the Godhead of Christ*: for which he quotes St. Basil saying, *Spiritus appellatio est Communis tribus personis*. And Tertul. *Iesus Christus est Spiritus dei*. St. August. also, *Quia deus Spiritus est potest dici Pater est Spiritus, filius est Spiritus, &c.*

2. He says the *Pharisees* had not heard of the Person of the Holy Ghost, of which some of the Disciples were not fully instructed: The Question was, Whether Christ acted by the Spirit and Power of God, or the Devil? And Christ proves he did it by the Spirit, (*i. e.*) by the Power of the Godhead.

The sence then of our Saviour's Answer, to make it pertinent to the Objection, is this; What I have now done, I have proved to be done by the Spirit of God; and though what you have spoken against me as the Son of Man, may be forgiven, yet what you, or any other shall speak against me as the Son of God, shall never be forgiven. Therefore he concludes, that to deny the Deity of Christ, is that Blasphemy; for to rob Christ of his Godhead, which is the foundation of the Remission of Sins, is to exclude ourselves from that benefit, *Qui negat deum in Christo caret omni Misericordia*; He that denies Christ to be God, cannot obtain mercy.

Hence the Fathers affirm, *Arius* and *Julian* who denyed the Deity of Christ, to be guilty of the Sin against the Holy Ghost, 2 St. *John* 4 3. *Every spirit or doctrine; Qui soluit Jesum*. (So St. *Hirom Prosp.* &c. read that Text) That divides the Deity of Christ from his Humanity, is Antichrist, St. *Ambrose de Fide*. And he is Antichrist that denyeth the Father and the Son, 1 *Job* 2. 22.

He adds, *It is dangerous because we have no firm footing from Scripture, Antiquity, or Councils*. Which because he only affirms, without shew of proof, it will be sufficient to deny. And though this Position were rash enough, yet what he adds is much worse, viz. *That the Athanasian may be numbered among the Roman Doctrines, and to be leveled with the Arian, equally unworthy of not only our Faith but our Study*.

Now the *Athanasian Doctrine* is not only agreeable to the *Nicene*, but they are both retained in the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, and how can he affirm himself a Son of the Church of *England*, who

bids such an open Defiance to the Doctrine of that Church? The *Nicene* Council grounded their Decrees on the Scripture, as they had been understood by the Primitive and Apostolical Fathers, before there was either Imperial or Papal Power in the Christian Church: and it is very strange, if this be not a more firm Foundation, than his corrupt Reason, when it is contrary both to Scripture, Antiquity, and Councils, and the sense of the Catholick Church in all Ages, as much as to the Faith of the Church of *England*.

In this Chapter the Doctor tells us of the Council of *Ariminum*, which was many Years after that of *Nice*, and was the greatest for number that ever was, but one of the worst (for the major part were *Arians*; ) the Doctor confessing, p. 38. col. 2. *That the Arians had all the Eastern Churches, except that of Hierusalem; that in this Council the Latine Church were circumvented by the Greeks, who when it was proposed by the Greeks, Whether they would worship Christ, or ομοούσιον; they cried, they believed not in ομοούσιον, but in Christ.* Before I answer this Objection, I shall add another which the Doctor urgeth, p. 14. c. 1. speaking of the Consubstantiality, he says, *It was a Mystery to those very Councils which determined it; and as it appears, says he, by those contrary Determinations of several Councils, and by the wavering of the same Council; for that of Serminum framed two or three, one whereof they would have reneg'd and laboured to recal its Copies.*

*Ans.* This Variety of Councils was occasioned partly by the influence of *Arian* Emperors, under whom at that time *St. Hierome* observed the whole World became *Arians*, but more especially by subtilty of those *Greeks*, of whom he speaks, who pleaded the Cause of the *Arians* in that Council of *Ariminum*, against the *Latine* Church; for those sort of *Greeks* were possessors of the Eastern Churches, as our Doctor observes. But the *Latine* Church adhered to the *Athanasian* and *Nicene* Creeds; and as Ignorant as the Doctor accounts them, they discovered and baffled the Sophistry of his subtle *Greeks*, even in that Declaration of theirs, *That they believed not in the ομοούσιον, but in Christ; (i. e.) not in such a ομοούσιον as some of those subtle Greeks would have imposed on them, contrary to the Opinion they had of Christ.*

Now this piece of Sophistry will thus appear: *Athanasius* speaking of some Hereticks, who used the word ομοούσιον, says, *That Paulus Samos. used it in a sense that might confirm his Error, and destroy the true Notion of the Word.* The Council of *Nice* agreed the meaning of it to be, That the Son had a proper Personality which made him the second Person in the Trinity, but was of the Substance with the Father. And *Socrates*, l. 1. c. 8. says, *They held the Son to be of the Father, but not as a part of his Substance; (which was the Error of Paulus Samos. Sabellius,*

## The Naked Gospel.

71

*bellius, &c.) declaring the Divine Essence to be undivided; contrary to the Opinion of those Hereticks, that held the Divine Substance to be divided between the Father and the Son.*

And in this sense they used the word *ὁμοούσιον*, which the Council of Nice accounted Heretical: this was known to the *Latine Church*, and when they proposed that word in a sense opposite to the *Nicene Faith*, they did (as they had just cause) reject it, and answered that subtle Question with a plain renouncing of the Error of those Hereticks that thought to impose their sense on them, *We will not worship ὁμοούσιον, but Christ.*

In this sense it was that the Fathers in that Council renounced the word *ὁμοούσιον*; *Eustathius* had this distinction from *Marcellus* his Master, whom *St. Hilary* and *St. Basil* call an Heretick. See *Socrates* l. 1. c. 23. and *Sozomon* l. 2. c. 11.

I shall here once for all give my Reader a short Account of the Controversy between *St. Athanasius* and *Arius*: *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, having heard of the Blasphemy of *Arius*, a Priest under his Jurisdiction, called a Synod of his Province, to enquire into his Opinions, and censure him: *Arius* appeared and maintained, *That there was a time when Christ was not; that he was Deus Factus, made a God, and so a Creature.* For these and other Heretical Opinions, he was Excommunicated, together with some others, whom he had drawn to his Opinion; and by their means the People were also divided, denying to hold Communion with each other.

The Emperor being informed how far the Dissention spread, and what Tumults had been already occasioned by the Controversy between the *Catholicks* and *Arians*, though not fully informed of the truth of the Question, made it his business to apply a seasonable Remedy to so great an Evil; and first he sent Letters by *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba*, both to *Alexander* and *Arius*, enjoining them to Peace and Brotherly Communion: 'I find, saith the Emperor, that the rise of the Controversy between you is this: That when you *Alexander*, required of your Presbyters what they thought of a certain place in the Law, or rather of a needless Question; and you *Arius* did imprudently reply, what you neither ought to think, nor being thought, you ought to have suppressed by silence; the Discord between you caused a breach in your Communion, whereby the People also were divided from the Unity of the Church: wherefore I Exhort, that each of you pardoning each other, do embrace what I your Fellow-Servant most justly require: for it was neither fit to move such a Question at first, nor being moved to return such an Answer to it; for such Questions which no necessity of the Law doth prescribe,



ought to be kept in our own Breasts, and not to be unadvisedly committed to the Ears of the Vulgar, lest we for the infirmity of our Nature, not being able to explain what is proposed, and the People through their dulness being not able to apprehend it, they necessarily fall into Blasphemy or Schism, for the Contention is not about any great Command of the Law, nor is there any new Opinion started concerning the Worship of God, but you both retain one and the same Opinion, (*so it seems the Emperour was informed*) and therefore may well live in the same Communion, as the various Sect of Philosophers do. Let us duly consider how unequal it is, that by your Contention about light and vain words, the People that lived as Brethren, should be divided as Enemies, by your strife about small and unnecessary things: These Actions are more agreeable to the Ignorance of Boys, than to the Wisdom of Priests, and wise Men; but seeing you have the same Faith, and the same Opinion of our Religion, and our Law requires concord of Minds, and the Controversie between you doth not concern the Substance of Religion, there ought not to be any discord between you.

This he said before he had been duly informed of the State of the Controversie; what his thoughts were afterward, you shall hear anon.

But as *Socrat. l. 1. c. 8.* says, neither the Emperour's Letters, nor the Endeavours of *Hosius*, could compose the Dissention; the Emperour therefore resolved to summon a General Council at *Nice*, in *Bitinia*, to which all the Bishops of *Europe*, *Africa*, and *Asia* were called; and there met above 300 Bishops, besides Presbyters, Deacons, &c. many of whom were eminent for Wisdom in Speaking, Holiness of Life, Patience in Suffering, Modesty and Meekness of Manners; these being assembled, the Emperour appears, the Bishops having done their Reverence, he sat not down himself, until he had beckned to them to sit down; and he spake first, exhorting them to Peace and Unity; and whereas they had accused one another in several Libels the day before, he enjoyn'd them to burn those Libels, and to forgive each other, as they expected Christ should forgive them: Then he gave them leave to propose the Differences that concern'd Religion, of which *Ensebius* in the Third Book of the Life of *Constantine*, gives this Account, *That many things being proposed by both Parties, the Emperour attended with great patience and intention of mind, weighing what was offered by both Parties, moderating and allaying their heats, and by his own arguments convincing some, and persuading others, they were at last brought to an agreement*; which was committed to Writing. Some particulars whereof, saith *Socrates, l. 1. c. 8.* I will repeat, least any should con-

condemn the Proceedings of that Council, or as *Sabinus* did, account them ignorant and simple Men, as particularly he did.

*Eusebius*, who subscribed not until he had strictly examined the Controversie ; however he commends the Emperour, as being very skilful in the Matters of Faith. *Socrates* also commends *Eusebius Pamphyls* as a faithful Witness of what was done in that Council.

The Faith then agreed on was drawn into the Form which is now in our Liturgy, to which they added an Anathema against such as should affirm, *That there was a time when the Son of God was not ; and that was made of things that were not , or that he had some other Substance or Essence created, or subject to change.* To this 318 Bishops subscribed, five only refused, because of the word *Consubstantial*, whereof *Eusebius* and *Theognis* afterward recanted, and were reconciled ; the rest kept in Banishment with *Arius*.

This *Eusebius* having after long deliberation assented to the *Nicene Creed*, sends a Copy of it to his People of *Cæsarea*, with a particular Account how it was examined ; and tells his People, That it was the same which he had received from the Bishops his Predecessors, when he was first instructed by them, and which they professed at their Baptism, and which he would defend with his Life ; he tells them, the Emperour confirm'd it first, with the addition of the word *Consubstantial*, to which they all agreed. And to remove the prejudices which his People might have conceiv'd against him, for standing out so long, till he was sentenced to Banishment, and then conforming, he tells them, with how great Judgment he considered both the Reasons of his Dissent, and of his Consent, suspending his Assent from the first to the last ; however, as long as he met with any thing that offended him ; but when after due examination he found the sense of the words controverted to agree with that Faith which he at first received, he embraced them. And what those were, he gives a particular Account, *viz.*

1. These words were examined, *Of the Substance of the Father* : concerning which there arose divers Questions and Answers ; and after Examination it was agreed, That the words of the Substance signified, *That the Son was of the Father, but not as a part of the Father* : to this I consented, as also to the word *Consubstantial*, for the sake of Peace : and that I might not fall from the right understanding of it, in like manner to the words, *Begotten not made* ; because it was urged, that the word *made* was common to the Creatures which were made by the Son, to which he had no likeness, being of a more excellent Substance, which the Scripture teach was of the Father, by a secret manner of Generation not to be expressed ; and this *Consubstantiality*

was

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entitled,

was not to be in a corporeal manner, as in mortal Creatures ; for it was not by division of Substance, nor Abscission, nor change of the Father's Substance and Power, because this was different from all those ; but it signifies that the Son had no likeness with the Creatures that were made by him, but was in all things like to the Father, by whom he was begotten, and of no other Substance ; and to this we consented, knowing that many ancient famous Bishops and learned Writers, speaking of the Divinity of the Father and the Son, used the same word. The Emperour also expressed the same sense of the word *Consubstantial*, which he said, *Was not to be understood, as if the Son were of the Father by Division, or any Section, as in corporeal Substances, because an intellectual and immaterial Nature admits not of the Affections of Bodies.*

And that you may know something of the History of *Arius*, I shall give you this brief Account.

*Arius* was a Priest of *Alexandria* in *Egypt*, a Man infinitely desirous of Glory and Novelty, as *Ruffinus* who knew him, reports ; one that corrupted many Virgins who had professed Virginity ; he and some others of that Church, whereof *Alexander* was Bishop, a Learned and Orthodox Divine, who suspecting that the Ancient Heresie which denied the Godhead of our Saviour was crept into this Church, as the Event shews it was, summoned his Clergy, and discoursing to them concerning the Mystry of the Trinity, told them of the Unity in the Trinity : *Arius* one of the Presbyters skillful in Logick, supposing the Bishop affected to the Doctrine of *Sabellius* thus objects to his Bishop. *If the Father begot the Son, then he that was begotten had a beginning of his Existence ; and so there was a time when the Son was not ; and if so, he had his Existence out of nothing, Socrat. l. i. c. 5.* From these unheard of Assertions, he provoked many to consider that Question, and from this Spark a great Fire was kindled, which spread through all *Egypt*, *Lybia*, and the Upper *Thebais*, and many other Provinces ; for many others favoured *Arius*, especially *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, which much displeased *Alexander*, so that by a Council of Bishops he removed *Arius*, and some others, and writes to the neighbouring Bishops to this purpose : *That wicked Men were risen up in his Diocess, teaching such a Desection as may be rightly called, A Fore-running of Antichrist : I could wish, says he, this mischief might have been confined among the Apostates ; but seeing Eusebius of Nicomedia undertakes their Patronage, and hath written Letters to recommend them and their Heresie, I could not forbear to forewarn you of these Apostates and their Opinions, and that you attend not to the Writings of Eusebius.*

The

The Names of those that have forsaken the Church, *Arius, Acbillas, Aitbales, Carpones*, another *Arius, Sarmates, Euzoius, Lucius, Julianus, Menas, Hellodius, Gaius*, and with these *Secundus*, and *Theanas*, who were formerly called Bishops. That which they rashly publish is this:

' God was not alway a Father; the Word of God was not alway, but had its beginning of nothing; for God which is, created him that was not, out of that which was not; and so the Son, they say, is a Creature, not like his Father in Substance, nor the True Word of God, nor his True Wisdom; but one of his Works and Creatures, but abusively so called, being made by the Word and Wisdom which is in God, that made him and all things: That the Son knows not the Father, nor can perfectly know him; nor doth he know his own Substance what it is; but was made as an Instrument by which God would create us; nor had he been made, unless God would have made us by him. To them that ask, whether the Word of God could be changed as the Devil was, they answer, Yea, that he is of a mutable Nature, because he was created. *Arius* with great impudence affirming these Things, We, together, with almost an hundred Bishops of *Egypt* and *Lybia*, did anathematize him and his Adherents; but *Eusebius* hath received them, that he may joyn Impiety to Piety, Falshood to Truth; but they shall not prevail, for Truth will overcome: for whoever heretofore heard such things, or now hearing them, doth not stop his Ears, who hearing *St. John* say, *In the beginning was the Word*, will not condemn these Mens sayings, *There was a time when he was not*, &c.

These Letters had various effects on a great many, and not much to the advantage of *Alexander*, for *Arius* and his Party were very diligent in writing on the contrary behalf; *Eusebius* also Bishop of *Nicomedia* heartily espoused his Cause, partly out of a private grudge between him and Bishop *Alexander*, and partly through his own Opinion, which agreed with those of *Arius*, and the Emperour being then at *Nicomedia*, with whom he was in favour, and by this opportunity he had great influence on the neighbouring Bishops, to whom he wrote divers Letters on the behalf of *Arius*; he wrote also to *Alexander* himself, admonishing him to receive *Arius* again into his Communion; and by these means the Divisions were so great, that not only the Bishops, but the People also ran into Parties; and the *Meletians* also joyned with *Arius*; so that they wrote to *Alexander* to recall the Excommunication against him, pleading, that his Opinions were right; for *Arius* did so palliate his Heresie, as that to the unwary and more ignorant sort, both of Clergy and People, it seemed

seemed nothing different from the Orthodox Doctrine.

The Emperor also wrote to a contrary purpose to the Church of Alexandria, *Socrates* p. 30. *That all things concerning the Controversies that were moved, had been accurately discussed and examined by the Council. But O ! what great and grievous Blasphemies some did declare against our Saviour ! and our Hope of Eternal Life ! producing things contrary to the Scripture inspired from above, and to the Faith, yet professing their belief of them ; whereas therefore more than 300 Bishops, which were to be admired for their modesty and diligence, conformed by their unanimous consent, that which according to the Rule of the Divine Law is the only Faith, Arius only was found, who overcome by diabolical fraud and design, did first sow this mischievous Evil among you and others ; but let us embrace the Opinion which Almighty God hath delivered, and return to our Brethren, from whose Fellowship that impudent Minister of the Devil hath separated them ; for that which hath been decreed by more than 300 Bishops, is to be esteemed, as the Divine Sentence seeing that the Holy Ghost residing in their Minds, hath revealed his Divine Will unto them. He assured them also, That the Definitions of the Council were not made without diligent examination. Wherefore in another Epistle to the Bishops and People, mentioned by *Socrates*, p. 32. of the Edition by *Valesius*, he says, *That the Arians following evil and malicious Men, deserved to suffer the same infamous punishment with them ; and as Porphyry who wrote against the Christian Religion had his Books destroyed, and himself branded to Posterity ; so it is my Command, That Arius and his Followers shall be call'd Porphyrians ; and that if any Book written by Arius be found, that it be consumed by Fire, that no remembrance of him may remain, and that such as conceal his Books shall suffer Death.* These were the Emperour's second thoughts.*

It hapned that *Constantia* the Emperour's Sister had entertained an *Arian* Presbyter, who often talkt of *Arius*, complaining to her, how much he was wronged by the Council at *Nice* ; but she durst not commend his Cause to the Emperour, till being sick, and often visited by the Emperour, she commended this Presbyter to the Emperour, as a devout and faithful Person, who having got into the Emperour's favour, he told him, as he had done his Sister, *of the hard measure Arius had from the Council, whom he affirmed to be of the same Judgment with them ; and that if he might be admitted to the Emperour's presence, he would declare his consent to their Decrees.* The Emperour wondered to hear this, and said, *That if Arius would subscribe those Decrees, he would not only admit him to his presence, but send him home to Alexandria with Honour, and wrote to him to that purpose.* See the Letter, *Socrat. Hist.* l. 1. c. 25. wondering that he had not declared sooner, seeing, as the Historian says, the Emperour had often exhorted him to it ; but being come



come to *Constantinople*, he with *Eusebius*, and some others, presented the Emperour an Account of their Faith in Writing; which was this, *To believe in One God the Father Almighty, and in the Lord Jesus Christ his Son, who was made by him before all Ages; God the Word by whom all things in Heaven and Earth were made; who came down, and was incarnate, who suffered and rose again, and ascended, and shall come to judge the Quick and Dead; and in the Holy Ghost, the Resurrection of the Flesh, and the Life to come; in One Catholick Church of God, from one end of the World to the other; this we believe, as God shall judge us now, and in the World to come.*

On this Confession the Emperour ordered his Return to *Alexandria*, whether he went, and revived the Divisions among the People, framing new Accusations against *Alexander*; the Emperour therefore recalled him to *Constantinople*, to question him for those Tumults, which he had raised there: but the same mischief followed him; for at *Constantinople* he found his Friend *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, and *Alexander* his Adversary, whom *Eusebius* threatened, that he should shortly be deprived of his Priesthood, if he admitted not *Arius* into Communion; at which *Alexander* being greatly troubled, prays and fasts, shutting up himself in the Church called *Irene*, and coming to the Altar, prostrates himself on the Ground, under the holy Table, for many days and nights, asking of God (and he received what he asked), *That if the Opinion of Arius were right, he might not live to the Day appointed for the Dispute; but if the Faith which he professed were true, that Arius might suffer the punishment due to his impiety.* The Emperour in the mean time sent for *Arius*, and willing to be better assured of the Faith which he professed, asked him, *Whether he would consent to the Decrees of the Council of Nice?* he presently answered, *He would*; and did subscribe them in the Emperour's presence; at which the Emperour wondered, and (suspecting some fraud) urged him to swear to them; and this he did also. Now the fraud which he used, (as I have been informed, saith *Socrates*, c. 38.) was this: *Arius* had written his own Opinions in a Paper, which he had hid in his Bosome, and swore that he did in his Mind believe as he had written. Then the Emperour commanded *Alexander*, who was then Bishop of *Constantinople*, to receive him into Communion the day following: *Arius* being about to go into the Church with his Companions, the Judgment of God seized on him, for going out of the Emperour's Palace, he walked through the City magnificently guarded by a company of *Eusebians*, drawing all eyes upon him; when he came to a place where stood a Porphyry Statue, a great terrour, through the consciousness of his wickedness, seized on him, and with it a great Looseness in his Bow-

els, and enquiring where he might step aside to ease himself, he was directed to a place near at hand, where being come, his Heart grew faint, and he voided his Bowels with his Excrements, with much Blood, and his Liver and Spleen followed; the place is yet to be seen, which all that pass by. do point at, relating the manner of *Arius's* death.

These Accidents did greatly confirm the Emperour in the Faith which was decreed in the *Nicene Council*.

*St. Ambrose* compares his Death with that of *Judas*, *That is, not a fortuitous Death*, (saith he) *where an Example of the like punishment on the like sin was inflicted before, that both should suffer the same punishment, who had denied and betrayed the same Lord*; for *Sozom.* says, (as it is said of *Judas*) *that he burst asunder.*

I shall only remark here, how much mischief one *Arian* Presbyter by his false insinuations with Men in Authority, may occasion in a well-established Church; which notwithstanding all his arts and industry, by God's good Providence, tended at last to the confirmation of the Truth.

In p. 38. col. 1. he tells us of the Settlement of the Controversie by *Theodosius*, though he could not be ignorant that *Constantine* had done it many years before; but he conceals the manner of doing it, (*viz.*) *How that he being sick at Thessalonica, was baptized by Ascolius Bishop of that place* (a Person of great eminency, both for his Words and Works, and adorned with all the Gifts of the Priestly Office); *being recovered, he resolved to propagate that Faith into which he was baptized, and which his Ancestors had profest, (viz.) that of the Nicene Creed; and he greatly delighted in Ascolius, as being of the same belief, as he did also in the Illirians, because none of them were infected with the pest of Arian Doctrines: and asking concerning the other Provinces, he was informed, that all the Churches as far as Macedonia, did all agree in the same Faith, and did worship God, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, equally with the Father: and being told of the other Provinces towards the East, that they were tumultuous and divided into several Sects, especially at Constantinople; and then thinking it better to declare unto his Subjects his Opinion of the Deity, he sent his Rescript from Thessalonica, to the People of Constantinople, that from thence, as from the Fort of the Empire, his Rescript might be speedily issued to other Cities.*

Now all this being in the same Chapter which the Doctor quotes, I wonder at the Doctor's Exclamations: *Behold now the ground on which one of our Fundamental Articles of Faith is built! Behold the Justice of that Plea, which from such a possession would prescribe to our belief: We have traced it*, says the Doctor, *from the Spring, with no worse intent,*

than

than to appeal from the Great Theodosius, who put it above dispute, to the Greater Constantine, who put it below dispute.

Now seeing he appealed to *Constantine*, we have his Decision, which I find the Doctor as faulty, as he judged *Arian* to be. In the mean time, I suppose from his own Quotation, that the claim of possession of this great Article of our Faith, is not either from the Great *Theodosius*, nor from the Greater *Constantine*, nor the Council of *Nice*, but from the Scripture, of him that is God over all, blessed for ever; and even *Socinus* himself agrees with us in this, and differs from the Doctor, in his Third Epistle to *Radcius*, affirming, *That even from the first beginning of the Church, there were so many Men most famous, as well for their Learning as their Piety, so many holy Martyrs of Christ which cannot be numbred, who followed this otherwise most grievous Errour, That Christ is that One God that created all things, and that he was begotten of his proper Substance.* And may not the Church of England admire how one of her true Sons is so much more a *Socinian* than *Socinus* himself, as to deny all this, that her Son should suppress the Testimony which he knew to be true, to serve an Errour, which he knows to be false and damnable: Did the Settlement of Christ's Deity begin with the Reign of *Theodosius*, and because he found some Hereticks that denied it, was he the first that founded it? Shall we call the Doctor the Author of *Socinianism*, because he first published it in *Exeter-Colledge*? We can shew the Succession of those Apostles and Apostolick Men that have derived the Consubstantiality home to our days in all the Churches *Greek* and *Latine*; I suppose the Doctor will not glory in the Pedigree of his Heresie, for so it hath been accounted ever since *St. John's Gospel* was written; or what temptation could a Man of his Education have, to number the *Athanasian* Doctrine which he hath so long profest, if he be not an arrant Hypocrite; among the *Roman, Theodosius* indeed recommended it to his Subjects, by a good Argument, viz. *That it was the Faith which St. Peter delivered at the beginning of the Plantation of the Gospel to the Church of Rome: Was St. Peter Popish, or was his Confession, viz. Thou art Christ the Son of the Living God, a Popish Confession?* Were his Successors for Three hundred Years, who were Confessors and Martyrs for the same Faith, Papal?

I am heartily sorry and ashamed to hear, how (to recommend the *Socinian* Doctrine) he proclaims the *Arian*, as well as the *Athanasian* Doctrine equally unworthy, not only of our Faith, but our Study; Is not this the Quintessence of *Socinianism*? See p. 39. c. 1. A very bold assertion is that which followeth, *That at the rise of the Controversie, most of the Bishops understood not its meaning, and that the best Ages of*

*the Church thought it not worth the knowing.* If by the first rise of this Doctrine he means the Council of Nice, as it is evident he doth, how they understood and valued it is beyond Controversie, and how far it was tolerated by Bishop Alexander, whom he calls the first Author of the Nicety, tolerated Arius, and his Confederates, by excommunicating and persecuting him, until God by an extraordinary Judgment took him from troubling that Church, which he had redeemed by his own Blood, is known in the Ecclesiastical History of those times; if his Scholars can presume of God's Pardon, or of Communion with his Church from that instance, it is a strong presumption indeed; the best means is to do what he derides, that is, to herd with the Primitive Christians and Martyrs, as he expresseth it, which departed the World before this unhappy Question was proposed; those I mean, who died in the belief of their Saviour's Deity; and I hope it is of them he says, (and not of Cerintus, Ebion, the Sabellians, and Samosatenians) that they are saved without dispute.

Athanasius challenged the Arians to produce one Father of any repute in the Church of God, that was of the same Judgment with them; which they always studiously declined, as *Socrates* shews by the instance of *Sisinnius*, l. 5. c. 10. And how the World came to be so much Arian as St. Hierom reports, is evident from St. Hilary, viz. *Because their Teachers concealed their own Opinions, and used such words in their Homilies to the People as the Catholicks did, whereby not only the People, but Bishops and Emperours were deceived by them: they told them, Christ was God, the true God, and God by Nature, perfect God before all Ages.* And hence as St. Hilary notes, the People remained Catholicks under Arian Bishops; but as he observes, *Contra Arium & Auxentium*, p. 215. They had their reserves, *They give Christ the Name of God, (says he) but as they give the same to Men; they confess him to be the Son of God, but as others in the Sacrament of Baptism are made the Sons of God. They say he was before all Ages, and so they say were the Angels and Devils; but that Christ is the true God, that is, that the Deity of the Father and the Son is the same; thus they deny: and hence it is, says he, that under the Priests of Antichrist the People of Christ are not corrupted, while they believe that to be the Faith which they hear in their Teachers words: They hear that Christ is God, they believe what they hear; they hear that he is the Son of God, they believe it to be true; they hear in *Dei natiuitate inesse Dei veritatem*, they hear that he was before all Ages, they think he was Eternal: *Sanctiores sunt aures Plebis quam corda Sacerdotum*, There is more Sanctity in the Ears of the People, than in the Hearts of the Priests. Thus was Constantius deceived; the Arian Priest, whom on the commendation of his dying Sister he took into favour, per-*

perswaded him, that *Arius* did believe all the Decrees of the *Nicene Council*, and as an ancient Writer says, *Hereticos admittit Constantinus Hæresin non Amplexus.*

If *Constantinus* favoured the *Arians*, it was not from any favour he had to their Heresy; and it is observed by *Theodoret*, l. 3. c. 8. that though he disliked the word *Consubstantial*, yet he owned the sense of it, *That the Word was God, that Christ was the true and natural Son of God, begotten of the Father before all Ages, and condemn'd them that call'd him a Creature.* And *Greg. Nazianzen* had the same Opinion of him, for he term'd him, *The most Divine Emperour, and greatest Lover of Christ*; and he was never accounted a Flatterer. The Councils also under him profess all the Articles of the *Nicene Creed*, the word *Consubstantial* only omitted.

*Elias Cretensis* gives this reason for the Laws which he made on the behalf of the *Arians*, That being deceived by wicked Men, he made Laws for their Toleration, against them that were pious. But this trick was learn'd them by one *George*, Bishop of *Laodicea*, who argued thus: *Seeing that God made all things, and all things were made of what was not, therefore the Son was made of things that were not, yet was he the Son of God as made by him.* *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*, and *Theognis*, who after great obstinacy subscribed to the *Nicene Decrees*, but would not consent to the Condemnation of *Arius*, gave this reason for it; because partly in the Letters which he wrote to them, and in the Conference they had with him, they could not judge him guilty of the Opinions charged on him. See *Constantine's Letter* in *Socrates* l. 1. c. 38. He used that *Maxime of Maschiavel*, *He that knows not how to dissemble, knows not how to live*: and therefore he complied with the Opinions of all of other Hereticks, but never could with the Orthodox, for which reason he was compared to the *Camelion*, of which Creature it is said, it could conform itself to all Colours, except the White.

P. 39. col. 2. The Doctor seems to accuse our Saviour of a Rhetorical Hyperbole, in appropriating to himself such great Titles: *It is very frequent for Rhetorick, saith he, to exceed, but never to diminish the Grammatical Character of a Person, whose Honour the Writer professeth to advance, and on this account they (i. e. the Socinians) think it more reasonable, that those expressions which exalt our Saviour's Person to an equality with the Father, should stoop to those which speak him inferior; than that those which speak him inferior, should be strained up to those which speak him equal: as if ourself had exalted himself above his degree, who so humbled himself as to become obedient to death, even the death of the Cross.*

But



But this is an Argument for which he is beholding to *Sandius* the *Arian*, who p. 139. of his Appendix, speaking of the Omniscience of our Saviour, pleads, *That such expressions are taken from the Flowers of Rhetorick, by which the things treated of are sometimes exalted, and sometimes depressed, and in the present Subject (saith he) is often given in the Praises due to Christ, against the Jews and Gentiles, thereby to aggrandize, not to depreciate him.* Wherefore the Doctor commends the *Arians* for a truer Method, who when one expression in Scripture seems to contradict another, take such a course to reconcile them, as the Laws and Customs of all the World direct, (*i. e.*) that those expressions which exalt our Saviour, should stoop to those that depress him; and this he adds is the safer way, since it will lead us to such a belief as will suffice for that end, for whose sake alone belief itself is required.

Chap. 10. Is intitled of the *Word or Matter* which is the Object of Faith: Here the Doctor undertakes to give us a Catalogue of Fundamentals, and in one or two general Aphorisms to discover why, and how far belief is necessary.

He rejects what Doctor *Hammond* wrote on that subject, as insufficient for satisfaction, and says, *It is like an Advertisement in a Gazette, which however exact, cannot secure from a mistake, though we meet the Man described.*

The reason of this Reflection on Dr. *Hammond*, of whom I shall only say, That if in this or the former Age, there were any more learned, there was not one more pious; or if there were any more pious, there was none more learned, is, because he hath so razed the very Foundations of *Socinianism*, that there needs no more to be said against it, than what that admirable Man hath written in that excellent Tract which the Doctor hath mentioned, as *Bathsheba* did *Adonijah* to King *Solomon*, against the Life of his Darling, 1 *Kings* 2. 23. for as no Man hath laid a better Foundation of Faith, it being the same which the Apostle laid, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. so none hath been more careful of the Superstructure of a Holy Life; and to prevent the laying on of such combustible matter as Wood, Hay, or Stubble, of which I shall give the Reader a brief Extract, that he may see how invidiously the Doctor reflects on it, as insufficient for our satisfaction, p. 40. c. 1.

I shall begin with p. 11. where Dr. *Hammond* acknowledgeth, that he took the first hint of his Notion, from the words of that great Champion of the Catholick Faith, set down in the Council of *Nice*, St. *Atanasius*, in *Epist. ad Epictetum*, where speaking of the Catholick Faith set down by the Canons of that Council, against the *Arians*, and other Hereticks, he says, *The Faith confessed by the Bishops in that Synod,*

*Synod, according to the Divine Scripture, is of itself sufficient for the averting of all Impiety, and establishment of all Piety in Christ, &c. Then p. 27. This one Corner-stone Jesus Christ, is a most competent ample Foundation on which to superstruct the largest Pile of Building, to erect a Church of pious Livers, and to bring all rational Men within the compass of it: which he asserts, p. 28. against the Doctor's Natural Religion; The Law written in Mens Hearts: Naturale Judicatorium, and a Light sealed upon us in our first composition, because the prescribed Duties wanted their full stature, if compared with Christ's super-additions. 2. The fortifications against Temptations were too slender, there being little knowledge of the Soul's Immortality, and of Rewards and Punishments in another Life; on which account St. Paul challengeth the wise Men of the World, 1 COR. 1.20. Where is the wise, &c.*

*Let all the Scribes or Doctors of the Law, the Searchers or profound Interpreters of the Scripture, bring forth such Evidences of their efficacy in reforming and purifying Mens Lives, as the Apostles had done, by these so despicable means, the Gospel of the Cross of Christ, p. 32. Then p. 33. he makes Mahomet (who, as our Doctor says, profess all the Articles of the Christian Faith) to have laid the grounds of all impurity in his carnal, sensual Paradise: and he concludes with a saying of Cbalcidius in his Comment on Plato's Timæus, which Dr. H. thinks he had from the Gospel, and says it contains the sum of it, That the Reason or Word of God, (no question, says Dr. H. the λόγος in St. John's stile) is God taking care of humane affairs, and is the cause unto Men of their living well, and happily if they do not neglect that Gift granted by the Supreme God. Dr. H. having said enough in this to discover the Nakedness of our Doctor, and his Natural Religion, goes on to shew the Nakedness of his Gospel, p. 35. by shewing, that Christ crucified, (i.e.) as he is the Sacrifice for the Sins of the whole World, the μέγας, or means of Expiation or Pardon, on our return and change, is absolutely necessary to found our hope, as that hope is necessary to excite our endeavours. This strikes the body of the Socinians to the heart; and then shews what is necessary to be believed concerning the Person of Christ, from 1 Tim. 3. 16. (viz.) That he was God manifest in the flesh: and observes, That it is the great Mystery of Piety, p. 42. (against the Doctor's deriding of Mysteries) of which he says, God was so intent on bringing Sinners to Repentance, that he was pleased to assume and manifest his will in, or by our flesh, and as God visible on Earth, to preach Reformation to us: and hence he says, All the Devils countermines in the first Ages of the Church, were designed purposely against this one Article, the Deity or Godhead of Christ Incarnate, N. B. as if he were not what he oft affirmed himself to be the Messiah, (i. e.) the Eternal Son of God, and God blessed for ever,*

ever, which was so the known Title of the God of Israel, that whenever the God of Israel was named in the Jewish Services, it was answered by all, by their adding these words, God blessed for ever, p. 46.

Had it been only a Prophet, tho' never so great and extraordinarily furnished with Signs and Wonders, he had been but a Servant of God, and there are many Presidents of resisting such; but the personal descent of God himself, and his assumption of our Flesh to his Divinity, was an enforcement beyond all the Methods of Wisdom that were ever used in the World, p. 45. And the Doctrine of Ancient and Modern Arians and Photinians, who so industriously lessen the Divinity of Christ, in pretence of Zeal to God the Father, to whom they will not permit him to be equal, extremely takes off from the Mystery of Piety, the Foundation of a good Life, laid in the Eternal God's coming down to preach it to us, and is a direct contradiction to those places where Christ is called God, Acts 20. 28. Tit. 2. 13. And the modern Socinians have taken out this principal Stone from the Foundation, God manifest in the Flesh.

P. 56. he says, That Baptism in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is a Foundation on which they that administered it were commanded to superstruct all the Duties of a Christian Life, Mat. 28. 20. The Authority of all and each the Persons of the Trinity, being purposely engaged in this one great Interest.

Dr. H. having treated of the Apostles Creed, comes in p. 84. to shew, That what is superadded, was apparently designed by the Compilers for some special use; to fence the Catholick Faith from the Corruptions, Depravations, Doubtings, and Contradictions of Hereticks, as in the Nicene Creed, the Oneness of our Lord Jesus Christ was added, when the Arians opposed the Apostolick Tradition, and by corrupting detected the words of Scripture to their sense: which Dr. H. shews more largely in his Note on 1 Joh. 5. 7. and of such Additions he says, That when the Church hath thought meet to erect an additional Bulwark against Hereticks, such as reject them may be deemed to side with those Hereticks, p. 86.

And this is the summ of what he says concerning the Athanasian Creed, the Doctrine whereof he says, is (well nigh all) to assert the Unity of the Divine Nature and Trinity of Persons, against those Hereticks who had brought Novel Propositions into the Church, of which Doctrinal part he says, that Athanasius being only a Father of the Church, they were not necessary to be explicitly acknowledged, nor absolutely imposed on any but such as were Members of some Church, that had actually received Athanasius's Explication, or than it appeared concordant with the more authentick universal Confessions, as every Doctrinal Proposition of it will be found to do.

As for the Damnatory Sentences, *Dr. Ham.* supposeth them to be interpreted in opposition to those Heresies that had invaded the Church, not that it defined it to be a damnable sin to fail in understanding or believing the full matter of any of those Explications. *Dr. Ham.* having as a wise Master Builder, laid this Foundation, shews how necessary it is for the end of building on it a holy Life, and an uniform universal Obedience to the Commands of Christ, in opposition to Idolatry, Formality, Hypocrisie, and to Sacrilege, Profaneness, and Impiety; as also to improve the Vertues of Obedience to Superiours, Charity to all Mankind, Purity of Flesh and Spirit, Contentedness and taking up the Cross; and lastly, how useful it is to confute false Doctrines, 1. Of the Romanists, as Penances, Indulgences, of Supererrogating Merits, of Attrition improved into Contrition by the Priest's aid, without change of Life, Dispensableness of Oaths, Arts of Equivocation, Purgatory, Cessation of Allegiance, and especially of Infallibility. 2ly, Of the Solifidians and Fiduciaries, the Predestinarians, and irrelative Decrees of Election and Reprobation, of the Divine Prescience, against the Socinians, who deny that God foresees all things, and though they grant his Omnipresence, and Omnipotence, yet question the infinity of his Science, which is apparently false, as appears by God's Predictions to the Prophets.

When I considered the Writings of both these Doctors, their Foundations and Superstructures, it brought to my mind those two sorts of Builders and Building mentioned by our Saviour, *Mat. 7.* the one built on that approved Rock of *St. Peter's Confession*; the other on that Sand; whereon *Arius*, *Socinus*, and that Man of an ominous Name, *Sandius*, pitcht their Tabernacles, the one stands firm, tho' for 1600 Years, the Rain descended, Floods came, and the Wind blew on it; the other, tho' like the Walls of *Jerusalem*, it hath been often attempted to be fastned, hath still been blown down; and may the Fall of it be still great.

*P. 41. c. 2.* Our Doctor says, *If the Relation between the written Word, and rational Consequence be so remote, as none but a skilful Herald can derive its Pedigree, then is a good Christian no more obliged to believe such an Inference, than is every good Subject to be a good Herald.* As if the Ignorant were no ways obliged to follow the Directions of the wise and good Men; or as if Subjects were not bound to obey those Laws, whereof they cannot ken those Reasons which the wise and consulting Legislators on good Reasons have established for their Security.

What tho' the Papists do most absurdly infer from Christ's Command to *St. Peter*, to feed his Lambs, that all those Popes which pretend to be his Successors are thereby commissioned to Rule and Govern all Nations and Persons in all Ages. Cannot so enquiring a Person as the Doctor, or one that is more, or one that is less rational,

N

from

from such Scriptural premises, as God was made Flesh, Christ is God over all, equal and one with his Father, with undeniable Reason infer, as the Catholick Church in all Ages hath done, *That he is the Eternal Son of God?* But such an Inference is so contrary to the *Socinian's* Reason, that it is equally rejected with contempt and derision, as Popish Impositions, and by the Doctor numbred among them. But *Bernardus non videt omnia.*

He undertakes therefore to bless the World with such a description of them, that it shall be as easie to know them, without pains or art, as it was for the meanest Beggar in the street, to understand whom King *Abasuerus* would Honour, when he caused *Mordecai* in Royal Manner to be publickly honoured, and by Proclamation enjoyned the People to bow the Knee, as he past by them.

The Qualifications for Matter of Faith, he says, must be these: 1. It must be easie to be understood by the meanest capacity; and therefore he rejects any thing that is called a Mystery, though God manifested in the Flesh be so called by the Apostle; yea, though the same Mystery be implied in that very Scripture which he quotes to prove his assertion, *viz. Rom. 10. 9. If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, (i.e.) that Jesus is the Lord, which no man can say, but by the Holy Ghost: (i.e.)* not by a natural Faith, but by a supernatural Revelation, such as our Saviour says, *Flesh and blood hath not revealed.* And it is observable, that though in the Title of this Chapter, he mentioneth *the Word*, as well as the *Matter* to be believed, yet he makes no mention of *the Word*, by which the Person of our Saviour is generally understood; so that Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Foundation of our Faith is excluded from being the Object of our belief; for he writes the WORD in a larger Character, which might induce the Reader to believe, that he meant as *St. John 1. 1. The Son of God*; which is the adequate Object of Christian Faith, but speaks nothing of him in all that Chapter.

2ly, He says, *It must be an expresse Word of God*: This no Protestant denieth; but they do generally urge it against the Papists, who teach as necessary Articles of Faith the Commandments of Men: And may we not conclude by this Position, that they who oppugne such a Fundamental, to which Eternal Life is promised, may come short of Salvation.

Christ saith, *He that believes and is baptized*; this is but one entire proposition as our Author observes, that it is not only he that believes, but he that believes and is baptized; and Salvation cannot belong to them that put asunder what Christ hath joyned, as the *Socinians* do in the Case of Baptism, which they call only a Rite and Ceremony.



3ly, He says, *It must be expressly honoured with the promise of Eternal Life to the Believer*: and therefore he says, p. 42. Col. 2. *Whoever ascribes it to any other Doctrine however true, however revealed, makes himself equal to Christ in Authority, and superiour in Faithfulness*: If then that Scripture of our Saviour, *This is life eternal to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, Joh. 20. 31. And 1 Joh. 5. 20. *We are in him that is true, even his Son Jesus Christ; this is the true God and eternal life*, 1 Joh. 5. 20. St. Augustine reads the Text thus, *To know thee, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, to be the only true God*: and so doth St. Chrysostom. Now if I say, *Eternal Life* be appropriate to this knowledge, that Christ is the true God, then it is a fundamental Article of Faith.

P. 43. *There can be no need of an Interpreter of Scripture, or Determiner of Doubts concerning Matters of Faith*, saith the Doctor: How then comes it to pass, that there are so many Controversies concerning Matters of Faith? and that each Party denies Salvation to their Adversaries, that differ from them? His appeal to natural Faith will never be able to determine the Controversies that are yet undecided, concerning such Fundamental Doctrines as are necessary to Salvation.

*Socinus de Adoratione Christi*, says, *Bonas rationes & rectas ex verbo dei consecutiones in sacris disputationibus aspernare nec admittere velle, hominis est sue causæ parum fidentis*. He says, 3. *We need not, ought not to be uncharitable to any who differ from us in other Doctrines, to the belief whereof the Promise is not appropriate*. But is Eternal Life any where promised to those that believe that Jesus Christ was only a Creature, and a meer Man? Can we hope for Salvation, without satisfaction to the Divine Justice? or can we make satisfaction? Is it not good Divinity to say, there is no Salvation but in the Name, and through the Merits of Jesus Christ, who died for our Sins, and rose again for our Justification?

I have shewn you how the Doctor would interpret this latter Scripture, *Rom. 4. ult. Commodius interpretationis* (as they call them) there; but if their little Criticisms, and false Punctuations should be admitted, the Scriptures would indeed be made, as he says, *A Nose of Wax*; witness their interpretation of *John 8. 58. Before Abraham was, I am*, (i. e.) say they, *Before Abraham was made the Father of the Faithful, and of many Nations that were converted by the preaching of the Gospel, I am*, viz. *the Light of the World*.

So Eniedinus renders the Confession of St. Thomas, as an Exclamation directed to God the Father, *O my Lord, and my God*; as (saith he) *we are wont to do, when we behold any strange sight*. And Chritt's

words to the Thief, *Luke 23. 43.* are thus pointed, *I say unto thee this day: Thou shalt be with me in Paradise, viz. When I shall come to Judgment.*

Thus *Francis David*, on the words of *St. Stephen, Act. 7. 59.* makes this Comment, *O God the Father who art the Lord of Jesus receive my Soul.*

In this *cb. p. 44. c. 2.* the Doctor says, *that the Remission which the Prophets promised, reached only to temporal punishments, but that by Christ to eternal life:* How then can a natural Faith secure us of Life eternal, when that Faith, though greatly improved by the Prophets, could not do it.

*Ch. II.* in this Chapter he revives and pleads for another Socinian Tenet; *for the Resurrection, not of the same, but another Body.* He propounds the Question thus, *Whether any Promise doth necessarily import a restitution of the same numerical Matter;* and undertakes to prove, *That it is more honourable to God, and more serviceable to the Design of the Gospel, to believe the contrary.*

But First, This is contrary to the Grammatical Signification of the Word, and to the Scripture by him quoted, *viz. That God gives to every seed his own Body:* And *Ruffinus* mentions the word *Hujus*, the Resurrection of this Body, which though it shall have a kind of Transfiguration, by subtraction of the old earthly Qualities, and the addition of such as are new and heavenly, yet the subject shall continue the same; which *St. Paul* means, *1 Cor. 15. 53. This corruptible shall put on incorruption; that as we have born the image of the earthly, we may bear the image of the heavenly;* and as *Job* says, *With these eyes see God, Job 19. 25.* And the Justice of God requires this, that as the Faithful have born the Marks of the Lord Jesus Christ in their Bodies, wherein they were Partakers of the Sufferings of Christ, and were consecrated to him as the Temples of the Holy Ghost, may partake of the Reward and Crown of Glory in the same Bodies.

What he says of our being *καρναλοί*, proves as well, that we shall have no Bodies, as that we shall not have the same. The change that shall be made in our vile Bodies, doth not alter the form of our Bodies, no more than it doth the Body of Christ, which though it be now a glorious Body, yet is still the same numerical Body; and to call that a Load of Carion, which the Apostle calls the Temple of the Holy Ghost, is not becoming a Christian Doctor. As we believe therefore that the same Body our Saviour which suffered, is now glorified, and that the same Bodies that remain to the last day, shall be taken up to meet the Lord in the Air, shall be the same Bodies that shall be ever with the Lord. And as we believe that Christ arose from the Grave  
in

in the same Body wherein he died, so we believe that he carried the same into the heavenly Sanctuary, and shall come at last in the same Body to judge both the Quick and Dead, that all Eyes may look on their Crucified Saviour; and unless it shall be the same Body, it cannot properly be called a Resurrection: And no doubt but our Resurrection shall be conform with that of Christ's, as the Apostle intimates, *Rom. 8. 11. He that raised up Jesus from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies.* To this purpose *St. Augustine* *Epl. 57. That as Christ glorified his own Body, but destroyed not its nature, so will he give Glory to our Bodies, but not take away the nature of them.* Nor indeed do other qualities any more alter the nature of our Bodies than of our Souls, which for substance shall be the same.

But lastly, if this Enquiry be a matter of Curiosity, not of Faith, why doth he oppose the Doctrine so long received in the Church, to bring in a *Socinian* Tenet?

And now *p. 50. c. 1.* he gives us the *Socinian* Scheme of the Naked Gospel, such as *Socinus, Crellius, Selichringius, Smalcus,* and the whole Tribe have fancied and published to the World before him: *That its business was to reduce the Jews from their Bondage under the Law of Moses; and the Gentiles from their worse bondage under the Worship of Devils, to the Service of God by the free Directions of their own Nature: That to this end he sent his only begotten Son into the World teaching them, That the best service of God consisteth in being like him, and for their encouragement therein, promising them upon their Repentance pardon of Sins past, and everlasting Life.* This, saith he, is the Sum of the Gospel, (*i. e.*) of his **Naked Gospel.**

Here is not a word of that Grace and Truth that came by Jesus, nor that God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself, *Making him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* Not a word of that Redemption (which *Sr. Peter* speaks of made for us) by the precious Blood of the Son of God, or that Christ redeemed the Church by his own Blood, dying for our Sins, and rising again for our Justification, *Revel. 1. washing us in his own Blood from our Sins.* Not a word of that which *St. Paul* made his whole work to preach, *Christ crucified, that others wish him might know him, and the power of his resurrection, that we may be found in him, not having our own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith, Phil. 3. 8, 9.* Nor that without the shedding of this Blood, there could be no Remission of Sins.

But though the Apostle counts this knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord, so excellent, that all things else are *but loss and outward dogs meat,*

Deus nil fecit.

in comparison with it : Yet the Doctor prefers his *Natural Faith*, or his *Carnal Reason* above all this ; for there is not one word of all this to cover the Nakedness of his New-born Gospel, but as the Socinians say, *God sent his only begotten Son into the World, to teach them* (not to die for them) *how by the free Directions of their own Nature without any grace or assistance of the Spirit of God, or any Revelations of that Grace and Truth that came by him : That the best service of God consists in being like him ; to which end he supposeth the free Dictates of their own Nature are sufficient ; promising them upon their Repentance, pardon of their Sins past, and everlasting Life.* Which John Baptist and other Prophets had done before him.

Not a word of Christ's giving Repentance, or that eternal Life is the gift of God, which he grounds on that Repentance which flows from the free Directions of their own Nature. What part Faith hath in all this, is his next Enquiry, which is to shew that it hath no part at all.

Enquiry II. He says is to shew, *What Changes or Additions later Ages have made in Matter of Faith.*

He tells us p. 50. c. 2. *That our Lord honoured it as the Great King did Daniel, above all his Princes : That he came into the World to advance it : That he promised it eternal Life ; and both he and his Apostle make it half the Gospel ; we meet it in every page of the New Testament ; and on sight of its glory, we talk as St. Peter did when confounded at the brightness of our Lord, we know not what.*

But our Author hath no sooner cried his *Hosanna* to Faith, as the Jews did to Christ, but presently proclaims his Crucifigite, and casts this Daniel into a Lion's Den, to be rent by such furious Beasts : he first casts her from the Throne wherein Christ placed it, and what the Gospel makes the Mother-Grace, he makes the Mother-Error ; p. 51. c. 1. his words are, *This is the Mother-Error, that whereas Faith is no better than a Retainer to Holiness, we place it in the Throne as an Absolute Prince, and think it our Duty to enlarge its Dominions as far, and exalt its Prerogative as high as we can, as if it were some precious Diamond, valuable for its Brightness, Hardness, or other irrelative Vertue of its own.*

Doth this Author know what he says, or consider whereof he affirms these things ? If it be of that implicate Faith required in the Church of Rome, or that naked Faith of the Gnosticks, or Solifidians, viz. a bare profession of Faith in Christ, separate from Obedience, he only beats the Air ; but if of that Faith required in the Gospel, and professed in the Church of England, the nature whereof he cannot but know, then he striks at the very Life of Christian Religion ; for that is a Faith working by Love ; a Faith in Christ's meritorious Death, Passion,

Passion, Resurrection, and Intercession ; which the Socinians will not admit of : A Faith that purifieth the Heart , that teacheth us that Christ dying for all, all were dead in Sins and Trespases, and that he died for all ; that henceforth they should not live to themselves, but unto him that died for them, and rose again : this is the true Christian Faith grounded on the Grace of God, *which bringeth salvation, and hath appeared to all men, teaching them, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live righteously, soberly and godly in this present world.*

This the end of manifesting the Gospel as St. Paul, Rom. 16. 26. This the Obedience of Faith ? This is the Faith which we preach in the Church of England, and which the Doctor so opposeth and vili-fieth. It is evident that the Faith which this Doctor would degrade, is that which hath for its Object Christ crucified, bearing our Sins, making an Atonement, bearing the Chastisement of our Peace, reconciling us to God by the Sacrifice on the Cross.

All which he would resolve into a Natural Faith in the Veracity of God, and so makes our Faith in Christ crucified (the chiefest Notion of a justifying Faith) to be of none effect.

But let us hear the Reason he gives for his degrading of Faith, p. 50. c. 2. *We consider not, saith he, that two of the reasons which induced our Lord to call so importunately for it are expired. Those Reasons I suppose we had p. 19. c. 2. 1. The Difficulties of believing. 2. The Danger of professing it.* To which there needs no other Answer, then what he himself hath given, p. 50. c. 1. *That Faith must necessarily be called for with importunity suitable both to the Difficulties and Dangers which at that time encompassed it ; and to the serviceableness which at all times accompanies it :* For is there not now also need of Faith to strengthen us against the Temptations of the World, the Flesh, and the Devil ? Or is our Fight now only against Flesh and Bloud ? are there not Spiritual Wick-ednesses also ? Are there not such Lusts as are as dear as a right Hand or Eye, that must be cut off ? And what is it that giveth us the Victory over these, and a world of others, but our Faith ?

Were not our Faith serviceable to these ends, he might have some excuse for calling our Saviour a humerfome and capricious Lord, as he doth p. 51. c. 1. and p. 57. c. 2. that without any other motive than his unaccountable will, imposeth a stupid belief of a multitude of impertinent and incredible Propositions, without, yea, (some of them) against all Reason, without any fruit but strife, contrary to the Simplicity wherein the Gospel glorieth, and to that contempt which God himself sheweth to acts of meer Understanding ; which opprobrious Terms he mentioneth also p. 51. c. 1.

Doth



Doth not the Doctor fix these opprobrious Terms on our Blessed Saviour, when it is evident, that our Saviour instituted the Sacrament of Baptism to be administred in his Name, as well as in the Name of the Father and the Holy Ghost; especially seeing the Doctor cannot deny Baptism to be a Fundamental of the Christian Religion, as having an expresse Precept, and a Promise of Eternal Life annexed to it? And to be baptized in the Name of the Father, &c. is to devote ourselves to the Worship and Obedience of the Person, in whose Name we are baptized; and by consequence being we are baptized equally into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we acknowledge them to be of equal Dignity, and are obliged to pay them equal Worship. This Precept of our Saviour being no part of the Doctor's *Natural Religion*, but a prime Fundamental of the Christian, doth irrefragably convince the Doctor to be guilty of gross Impiety, when he in p. 57. c. 2. and p. 51. c. 1. discoursing of the Changes which later Ages have made in Matters of Faith, under which, by the tendency of the whole Book, that of the Doctrine of the Trinity is chiefly intended, he infers our Saviour to be a *humorous and capricious Lord*; and what means this passage p. 30. c. 1. *That it must cast dishonour no less on his Wisdom than his Majesty, &c. if we think he will grant Salvation on no other Terms, than a belief of the whole truth concerning the Dignity of his Person; for this will imply that he came and suffered on purpose to purchase to himself the honour of such a Belief, &c.*

P. 52. c. 2. *The proper Dominions of Faith*, he says, exceed not this one proposition, *That God cannot lye.*

*Ans.* What difference then is there between the Faith of a *Jew* or a *Turk*, and that of a Christian, they believe this as firmly as the Doctor doth, and are they as much Christians as he?

He allows it no value from its relation to the Person of Christ, though he doubteth not the Person of Christ to be infinitely valuable: The *Turks* grant he was a just Man, and a true Prophet, but not an All-sufficient Saviour. But who are they that advance Faith above Holiness, yea, against it too? not only the thorough-paced *Antinomians* and *Solifidians*, but many who call themselves *Orthodox*, who say, *Faith is the hand whereby we apply Christ to ourselves; and by this application Christ is made ours, and his Righteousness imputed to us, as if it were our own, and it justifies not by its own worthiness, but by the Merit of Christ, which it lyeth hold on, and applieth.*

I perceive the Doctor learnt this from Mr. *Beedle's* Preface to his *Socinian Catechism*, where he rejects the same Tenets, because they are not to be found in expresse terms in Scripture, (*viz.*) *The apprehending and applying of Christ's righteousness to ourselves by Faith; of Christ's righte-*

*ousness*

ousness imputed to us ; of Christ's dying to appease the wrath of God, and reconcile us to him ; of Christ's Merits, or his meritorious Obedience, both active and passive: of which he says, *That as these forms of speech are not owned by the Scripture, so neither the things contained in them.* I doubt not but the Doctor read that Preface, and applies it to the same end.

*And where in the name of Christ (saith our Author) do we in all the Book of God, or in Reason, (which he alway equalleth with the Scripture) meet any intimation of this fine Doctrine, Application of Christ to our selves ; the hand of Faith, imputed Righteousness, &c. What are they but Terms of Art, invented by false Apostles ?*

But were the Compilers of our Liturgy false Apostles ? Or do we not find the matter, if not the words therein, when we pray God to deliver us by his Cross and Passion ? Or is there no Merit in them, when we are taught to pray, *That by the Merits and Death of Jesus Christ, and through Faith in his Blood, we and the whole Church may obtain Remission of Sins, and all other benefits of his Passion.* See the Prayer after the Communion.

Do not they inform us of the \* meritorious Cross and Passion of our \* In Warn-  
Saviour, whereby alone we obtain Remission of our Sins, and are made Partakers of the Kingdom of Heaven ? Or was he a false A- <sup>ing the</sup>  
postle that teacheth us, *That Christ was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him ?* Commu-  
nion.

But the Doctor will not recede a hairs breadth from his Socinian Principles lest he should acknowledge, that Christ died for our Sins, and rose for our Justification, which he says, the particle *quia* will not bear, p. 14. c. 2.

The Doctor is much pleased with his Microscope, which discovers a multitude of little Animals, where the best eye sees nothing but limpid Water : But had he a spiritual Eye he might by the Mirror of the Gospel, discover many saving Truths, which to a carnal Eye are not discernable.

Another Complaint against Faith is, p. 54. *That it is exalted above and against Charity* : and he calls the Dispute (between the Arians and Catholics concerning the Eternal Deity of Christ) *the first and* P. 55. c. 1.  
*most uncharitable Dispute that ever rent the Christian World.* But who began these Disputes but Ebion, Cerinthus, and the Arians, who used the Gospel as the poor Man was used that fell among Thieves, left it naked and wounded, and opposed all that came to its relief ; were we all united in the Faith of the Gospel, which teacheth us, that *we have one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, viz.* in the Holy Trinity ; it would be a more effectual means to enlarge Charity, than the new Heresies that deny the Lord that bought them ; and being unchari-  
table

*An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,*

table to their Lord, cannot be otherwise to his Servants; they that thus wound the Head, the Deity of Christ, cannot but rent the Members, who by that Faith are united to him: The old Serpent was permitted to bruise the *Heel of the Messiah*, (*i. e.*) as Commentators say, *his natural Body of flesh and blood*; but these Serpents attempt his Head, (*i. e.*) his Divinity; but in vain, for he shall break their heads.

The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against our Faith, that Christ is the Son of the Living God; upon which Christ hath founded his Church.

The great Complaint against Faith is yet behind, *That it is exalted above and against Reason*; for nothing is to be believed further than Reason proveth it to be true, p. 56. c. 1. That is, the Socinians Reason. But by the assistance of Faith, the Christian may believe things above Reason, though to a carnal Apprehension they seem contrary to Reason: Why else doth our Saviour pronounce them blessed, that have not seen, and yet believed, (*viz.*) as St. Thomas did) that Christ is their Lord and their God.

This is another great Fortrefs of the Socinians, from which they tell us, in the Doctor's Language, *That Articles of Faith above the apprehension of Reason, are like the Ravings in Bedlam*, p. 56. c. 1. A cast of Tertullian's *Montanism*, *Credo quia impossibile*; and that excess of Confidence (he means our Christian Faith) in defect of Reason is a certain symptom of Madness. To this Fortrefs, as their Frontier Garison, all the Socinians resort; nothing can be believed which cannot be understood and comprehended by Reason. So Schlinchringius against Meisner, *It implies a Contradiction, that what exceeds the reach of Reason should be made an Article of Faith*: As if when the God of Heaven revealing his Will doth injoyne any Commandment, or requires the belief of any Proposition upon his Authority, which the reason of his Creatures is not able to comprehend, or demonstrate to itself, he did enjoin the belief of Contradictions. As in our Author's instance, when Abraham believed against Hope and against his Reason, he believed on the Authority of God that required him to offer up his only Son Isaac; And why may we not as well believe that God sent his Eternal Son to be Incarnate, and come down from Heaven for our Redemption; tho' we cannot comprehend it, we ought to believe the thing, tho' we cannot comprehend the manner.

Natural Faith relieth upon natural Reason, but Divine Faith upon Revelation, which may be above, but not against Reason: If you require any other Testimony, it is not Faith, *Vides* (saith St. Augustine) *non est fides*; what thou assentest to because thou seest a reason for, it

is not Faith, *Faith is the evidence of things not seen*, Heb. 11. 1. That properly is Faith, which gives up its assent to a Proposition on the Testimony of him that propounds it; and in this case we say with the Doctor, *Let God be true, and Humane Reason a Liar*. Humane Reason hath the judgment of Discretion; the judgment of Decision belongs to the Scriptures; to the Scriptures I say, not as understood by any private Interpretation, but as interpreted by the Analogy of Faith, by the Harmony of the Old and New Testament, and by the general Consent of the best Teachers in all Ages; and to this we shall Appeal for the Decision of this great Truth, That our Saviour is the Eternal Son of God.

There are certainly more plain Contradictions in the *Arian* Doctrines in this, viz. *That there should be an Omnipotent and Omniscient God that created all things, and knows the secrets of all hearts, and that this should be a created God*; for the *Arians* grant *Christ to be the Creator of the World*. That God should be reconciled to Man, that by Transgression is his Enemy, hating, and hateful to God, without any satisfaction to his Justice; this is to reconcile Light and Darkness, Heaven and Hell, or that a Finite Creature, as a Created God must be, could satisfy an infinitely offended Justice.

Nor is there any Article of our Christian Faith that seems so contrary to Reason, as is their measuring of an Infinite Essence by Finite Reason; that which measureth should be able to contain the thing that is measured.

Again, To give Divine Worship to a Creature, by what Name soever it be dignified or distinguished, which is due only to the Almighty God, our Creator, is contrary both to sound Reason and Scripture, which the *Socinians* (some of them at least) do, and on their own Principles are guilty of Idolatry.

The Difference among the *Socinians* concerning giving Divine Worship to Christ, will save us the labour of proving them to be Idolaters, if Christ be not the Eternal Son of God.

*Socinus* would not hold him for a Christian, that would not worship Christ with Divine Worship.

But *Christians* *Frankin*, *Francis David*, and some others (who agreed with *Socinus*, that Christ was but a Man) urge this Argument to prove *Socinus* and his Followers to be Idolaters, because they worshipped him, whom they believed to be but a Creature.

The Argument is thus formed: *As great as is the distance between a Creator and a Creature, so great ought the difference be of the Honour that is given to the Creator from that which is given to the Creature: but the distance between the Creator and Creature is the greatest distance, therefore*

there ought to be the greatest difference in the Honour that is given to the Creator from that which is given to a Creature. Hence they conclude Socinus and his Followers who worshipped Christ with Divine Worship were Idolaters.

But to this they answer, That if it be the pleasure of God to have it so, so it must be; and for this they quote St. John 5. 23. That all men should honour the Son as they honour the Father. To this Franken replies, That by Socinu's own Doctrine the Scripture he says must not be believed, because it is contrary to Reason, and therefore there is some other hidden sense in that Scripture which must be searched out. N. B. and Franken urgeth Deut. 6. 13. repeated Matth. 4. 10. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. And it is farther urged, that Crellius saith the word only in John 17. 3. where Christ says, This is life eternal to know thee the only true God; that by it Christ excludes himself from being the true God. And by the same word, say his Adversaries, Christ excludes himself from being the Object of Divine Worship.

This Franken confirms farther against Socinus, from Isa. 42. 8. My glory will I not give to another: and observe who speaks, I am *Jebovab*, that is my name, and my glory, &c. What Glory is that? *Gloria Jebovatis mea*, as Calomus's Phrase is; that is, The Glory of my Godhead. So in Jer. 23. 18. That men may know that thou whose name alone is *Jebovab* art the most High. *Jebovab* then is the Name of the most high God, and his alone, so that it cannot be given to any other who is not the most high God: but this name *Jebovab* is given to Christ in the Scripture, therefore he is the most high God. This Argument shall be confirmed hereafter. In the mean time we have gained this Point, viz. That if Christ be the Object of Divine Worship, as the Socinians grant, then must he be the Eternal Son of God, of the same Essence with his Father; and as St. Paul speaks, God over all, blessed for ever.

Now if the word only in St. John exclude Christ from being the true God, then the same word in Deut. and St. Matthew exclude him from Divine Worship; wherefore if his being the true God, be against the Reason of Socinians, though never so plain in Scripture, we must search out some other hidden sense, as Socinus says; and what other or better sense can we find, than what the Catholick Church alway affirmed, viz. That Christ with his Father and the Holy Ghost is the only true God. And thus St. Augustine, as hath been said, renders it, This is Life eternal to know thee, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, to be the only true God, Cont. Arium. Tom. 6. n. 17.

P. 54. Against Christ's Righteousness imputed to us, he tells a Story of a Land that was wasted with a raging Plague, to whom came a great Physician,



*Physician, declaring he had a Noftrum which never failed to cure those that trusted it; that it cost him dear, but he would freely communicate it to all that needed and desired it, and exhorted all to come to him; which many did, and were cured, but some said there needed no more but to trust to the Medicine: The Physician was infinitely skilful in his Art, and faithful in his Promises, wherefore by confidence in him, they should have all his health imputed to them, and that should cure them as perfectly as if they received real health by the use of his Prescriptions.* This is a Fiction of his own, to serve his Hypothesis, which I shall answer by a more probable Story out of the *Midras Tebillim*, or the Exposition of the Psalms, where on those words, *Kiss the Son*, we have this Parable, 'This is as when a certain King was displeased with the Inhabitants of a great City, the Citizens went and made Supplication to the King's Son, to appease his Father's displeasure: The Son went and effectually prevailed with his Father to forgive them, and take them into his Favour; which the King's Son having signified to the Citizens, they addressed their Thanks to the King. The King bid them go and give Thanks to his Son, for had it not been for his Mediation, their City had been destroyed. This is that which is said, *Kiss the Son*; and it may be well for the Doctor if he would go and do likewise.

It is not good to make sport of holy Things, and droll on the Mysteries of our Salvation, comparing them to Fables, and this in Scripture Phrase, ridiculing the Peace of God, as passing all understanding; and the Meritorious Death of our Saviour to the Prescriptions or Juggles of a Quack, as if Faith in the Power and Merits of our Saviour, were as vain as the Opinions of the Mobile concerning an Emperyck; yet we read of great Miracles wrought by Faith in the Person of Christ.

P. 41. Thus the Leaper by his Faith, *Lord if thou wilt thou canst make me clean.* And the Centurian's Faith prevailed for his Servant, *Matth. 8.* And as many as touched the hem of his garment were healed by their faith in his almighty power. There could not therefore be a more odious Comparison; he says of the Mystery which the Apostle spake of to the *Ephesians*, *That though it were hard to be believed, yet it was easy to be understood, for it signified only, That the Gentiles were Fellow-Heirs with the Jews.* But was not this a Mystery hid from that Nation until Christ and his Apostles revealed it: wiser Men than the Doctor do rightly admire some Secrets in Nature, which when their Causes and Natures are discovered, very ignorant Men may apprehend: this the Doctor says to shew, *That it is so far from being an honour, that it is rather a defect:* As if there were no difficulty in Matters of Faith, and the Mystery of Godliness mentioned by St. Paul in *Timothy*, viz. *God*  
mani-

*manifested in the flesh, were no harder to be understood, than that Mystery which had been so clearly revealed, The admission of the Gentiles to a fellowship with the Jews. This is to serve another Hypothesis of his, That we are not bound to believe, what we cannot understand by our Reason; and so to invalidate our belief of the Union of the Divine and Humane Nature in Christ: for saith the Doctor, p. 22. col. 1. If we will needs enquire into the Mysteries of Christ's Divinity and Incarnation, we shall find our Understandings no less confounded by the brightness of the Mystery, than our Eyes are by the Sun, and of this the Holy Ghost warns us, not only by a careful silence concerning our Lord's Genealogy, but by express Types and Prophecies, concerning its inscrutability: So that by the Doctor's Propositions, neither our Knowledge, nor our Faith, have any thing to do about the Divinity (he will not call it the Deity) of our Saviour, or his Incarnation, it matters not whether we know or believe any thing concerning either.*

*I shall not charge the Dr. with any thing that he hath not expressly said; and therefore do acknowledge that what he speaks of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, falls not under our debate; but I know that the Socinians say, that there is no firmer footing for the Doctrine of the Trinity in the holy Scripture, than for Transubstantiation; and the Socinians at Alba Julia, in a Treatise printed 1568. say thus, Whoever believes the Pope to be Antichrist, doth truly believe the Popish Trinity, Infant Baptism, and other Popish Sacraments to be the Doctrines of Devils.*

*And when I consider that the Naked Gospel is bereaved of this Doctrine, and intended not so much against the Doctrine and Sacraments retained in that Church, as against what is maintained in the Church of England, I submit it to the Judgment of others, whether these following expressions of the Authors, do not reflect on the Doctrine of our Church, when he speaks of a pack of impertinent Mysteries, p. 58. col. 2. And that Mahomet among all his Whimsies, hath nothing comparable to it, p. 59. col. 1. And that the Achanasian Doctrine may be numbred with the Papal, and of the Contradictions which are in the one, as well as in the other.*

P. 41. c. 1.

P. 21. c. 1.

*P. 56. c. 2. The Doctor seems much offended at the word Mystery, tho he knows theretis nothing reserved from the youngest Catechumens in the Church of England, who is diligently instructed in the Principles of Religion, by order of the Church; yet he must grant, that there were many things in the Scripture, which continued to be so, until they were revealed; such were those Mysteries mentioned by St. Paul, 1 Tim. 3. 16. Without question great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, believed on in the world, received*

up into glory : And such were those Parables which our Saviour proposed to his Disciples, which exceeded their apprehensions, until they were expounded to them by our Saviour. And such was that Mystery which the Apostle speaks of, *Ephes. 1. 10.* and *Ephes. 3. 6.* which was not made known to the Sons of Men in other Ages, as it was revealed to the Apostles and Prophets by the Spirit, (*viz.*) *That the Gentiles should be Fellow-heirs, and of the same Body, and partakers of his Promise in Christ, by the Gospel :* But when the Gentiles were taken in to be Fellow-heirs with the believing Jews, then it ceased to be a Mystery ; and surely there is another Mystery in *v. 9.* of that 3d Chapter, which our Doctor cannot yet apprehend, tho' plainly revealed, (*viz.*) *That God created all things by Jesus Christ ;* which though frequently asserted in the Scripture, as *Coh. 1. Heb. 1. &c.* yet the Socinians utterly deny ; nor can they apprehend what is that Righteousness which is by Faith, as opposed to that which is by the Law, or to our Doctor's *Natural Faith* : but the Doctor tells us of another Mystery, little less than a Contradiction, as *p. 1. c. 2. viz. The Patriarchs knew only the Fathers :* yet *Abraham* had the knowledge of Christ ; and our Saviour says, that *Moses* spake of him, and the Doctor affirms the same. That *Moses* spake of Christ, *Deut. 30. 12.* for the Doctor saith, *p. 41. c. 1.* that the Apostle applied that place to Christ : *If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart, that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.*

See Crellinus,  
Heb. 1. v. 10.

It was not so much in dislike of the Popish Mysteries, that the Doctor so often rejects whatever is above human Reason, under that Notion, as in dislike of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Eternal Generation of our Saviour, of which he speaking, *p. 34. c. 1.* says, *If you understand not this, you must not wonder, at least not gain-say it, for it is a Mystery which Reason cannot fathom, and therefore must be rejected as one of the Packs of Impertinent Mysteries, p. 58. c. 2.*

The Doctor that writes so mystically himself, should not be so much displeased, if he meet with some Mysteries in other Writings, especially in the Scripture, wherein, as *St. Peter* observes of *St. Paul's* Epistles, *There are some things hard to be understood, and will not be fully explained till Elias come.* And indeed as Naked as his Gospel is, it is darkened with so many obscure mists, and subtle insinuations, that it will appear to some of his most diligent Readers, to be one continued Mystery of Iniquity.

It is a sorry shift, which *Sandius*, and others that write against the Trinity, make to excuse themselves ; for thus *Sandius* pleads, see his Appendix, *p. 107. That he wrote his Book on behalf of the Protestants, a-*  
gainst

gainst the Papists to convince them that the Scripture is the only Rule of Faith, because they could not prove the chiefest Articles of their Faith, (viz.) the Trinity, Consubstantiality and Coequality from the Tradition of the Fathers of the three first Ages. In this our Doctor follows Sandius, and would persuade us to renounce the Doctrine of the Trinity, because it is a Popish Doctrine. See more of this in another Epistle of Sandius, p. 261. I have proved, saith he, that the whole World in the fourth Age was Arian, and the Arians enjoyed Temporal Felicity, and wrought Miracles, to shew against the Papists, that these are not marks of the true Church: I reckoned diverse Councils of the Arians who condemned the Catholick Faith, to shew that we ought not to depend on their Determinations in Matters of Faith, but on Scripture only: I have shewn that the Church of Rome hath honoured many Arians that were of very evil lives, as Saints, to shew you what manner of Saints the Papists do Invocate by the Authority of the Infalible Church of Rome, &c. All this is right: but when the whole design of his Book is to shew that the Doctrine of Arius denying the Godhead of Christ, and making him a Creature, is more consonant to Scripture and Antiquity, than that of the Trinity in the Church of Rome, is to condemn all other Churches that maintain the same Doctrine; for to this purpose tends that which remains in the Third Enquiry, concerning the Papists, who do impose new Articles of Faith, and set their Traditions and Decrees in an equal rank with the Scriptures, and sometimes above them, with a *Nonobstante* to Christ's own Institutions, as the Socinians do by their Reason: let them therefore dispute the Case with each other, and let Baal plead for himself: He cannot wound the Church of England through their sides, unless he can prove the Doctrine of the Trinity to be a Popish Tradition; which he doth more than intimate, and herein he would do them more service than any of their Champions, by proving Popery to be more ancient than the Council of Nice.

I am now come to the Conclusion of the Author, who shuts up his *Naked Gospel* as generally the Socinians do, with a Plea for Toleration to all that confess the Lord Jesus, and believe that God raised him from the Dead, though they leave him as Naked a Lord as the Doctor hath left the Gospel, robbing him of his Eternity and Deity, and that Honour and Worship which on those considerations are due to him, our Faith in his Name, Obedience to his Commands, a devout use of his Holy Sacraments; and so turn *Turks*, *Jews*, or (as some English Socinians have done) *Quakers*, and live above Ordinances, satisfying themselves with a Christ within them, and a *Natural* or *Naked Gospel*, as Mr. Pen in a Socinian Tract hath done. This he calls giving

giving Faith its due Bounds, by imprisoning it and dismembring it, separating Obedience and Love, which are inseparable from Evangelical Faith.

And as for Love, saith he, *we must give it its due boundlesness even to them that love not, but deny and bid open defiance to the Godhead of Christ, to whom the Apostle denounceth Anathema.* I wish heartily the Doctor had shewn more Charity to the Church of Christ in general, than to think and speak of them as guilty of Idolatry in all Ages; for so are they that give Divine Worship to a Creature, and that he who stiles himself a Son of the Church of *England*, would not defame her as tainted with Popish (because she holds the *Athanasian*) Doctrine, (for he calls that and the *Nicene their Creeds*, and our Litany *their Litany*) and so becoming a Papist to the Papists; and it's much better to be an *Athanasian* Papist, than an *Arian* or *Socinian* Heretick.

The Doctor tells us in the Vindication, p. 7. of his intention to have presented his *Naked Gospel* to the Convocation, that they might be induced to enlarge their Charity, at a time when all the Christian World expected it from them: And was all the Christian World once more become *Arians*, that they should become Disciples to his *Naked Gospel*, I cannot conceive what compliance the Doctor could presume of from that Convocation; he well knows their Prolocutor was the same that agreed shortly after to the burning of it in the Convocation at *Oxford*; and doubtless both he and the several Members would have had the same Resentment of it at *Westminster*, as the *Oxford* Convocation had, *When therefore we see a Viper rising out of the Fires of Oxford, and hissing, p. 5. That the Heresie lay not in the Book, but in the Conclusion; he deserves to be shaken into the Fire again, for the impotent Creature doth not only hiss at the mistaken Author of Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari, but on the whole Convocation, for their stiffness to their Constitutions; whose very Authors (says he in the Conclusion) were they now living, and true to their own reason, must be willing to abolish them.* This is the Doctor's enlarged Charity to the deceased Compilers of our Liturgy, that they would have done as he desireth, (*i. e.*) removing the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creeds; the Litany, Doxology, and I know not what Constitutions besides; the Institutions of our Saviour, (to wit) the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, the ends whereof this Doctor with the *Socinians* doth utterly destroy, and retains them only as Rites and Badges of an outward Profession of a *Naked Gospel*.

But let us enquire wherein this enlarged Charity of the Doctor's doth consist: Charity is either the love of God, or of our Neighbours; Now first, our love to God ought to bear proportion with the



## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

love he hath bestowed on us; of which the Apostle, *Joh. 3. 16.* saith, *God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.* And *Ver. 17.* *That the world by him might be saved.* The World then without Christ was in a lost and perishing condition; God had for Sin shut them up under a sentence of Condemnation; and it was his infinite Goodness and Wisdom to contrive the Means of our Salvation, such as might reconcile us to himself; to which end he thought this the fittest, to send his only begotten Son into the World to dye for our sins, *the just for the unjust, making him to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him:* of this love the Apostle with admiration says, *Behold, what manner of love the Father hath shewn to us, &c.* If God had only sent a Prophet, a Man of God, to make a fuller Declaration of his Will, this had not been a reason of so great Admiration; but when he sent his only begotten Son, that was one with the Father, and laid help on him that was mighty, able to save us to the utmost, being God and Man; this deserves the *Sic So*, and the *Eccs Behold*, and our admiration, *What manner of Love*; had he been the Son of God only by a miraculous Conception, which freed him from Original Corruption; had he only lived a Holy Life, and left us a good Example; had he only died to confirm the truth of his Doctrine, as the Socinians say, the Birth of St. John Baptist, his austere Life and Death might come near to all this. The Gift therefore here spoken of, must be such as became the Infinite Goodness of God; such as might reconcile his Love to us, with his Love to his Justice; such as might be sufficient to satisfy for the Sins of all that should believe in his Son, and obey the Commands of God by him: Which now is the greater Obligation of our Love to God, to believe (as I have said) the Socinians do, or as the Catholicks, *That God sent his only Begotten, (i. e.) his Eternal Son, the Wonderful the Mighty GOD, to satisfy for our Sins, to instruct us in all things that concern the Glory of God, and our own Salvation; to bear our Prayers, and relieve all our Necessities; to sanctifie our Souls, and make us Partakers of the Divine Nature, by the operation of the Spirit of Grace.* This is Love, and this the Gift that God bestowed on us through his Infinite Love; and in some proportion we ought so to love God as he first loved us: And to think of, and esteem of this Gift less than what the Scripture hath valued it at, is not rightly to apprehend his Love, or our infinite Obligations to make suitable Returns.

2. As to our Love to Christ; if he were only a Man that taught us the Will of God, so did the Apostles; if he died only to confirm his Doctrine, and give us an Example of Constancy and Patience, so have many

many Martyrs done: But *Rom. 5. 7, 8. God commended his love to us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us*; and had he only died for us, and not been able to rise again, and to take up his life as well as to lay it down; had he not destroyed all the Enemies of our Salvation, and ascended to Heaven, having all Power committed to him, we might argue as the Apostle doth, *If Christ be not risen*; and if he be not the Eternal Son of God, to make Intercession for us, and to send the Holy Ghost to sanctifie us, then is our Preaching vain, and our Faith is vain, and we are yet in our Sins; but now we may sing our Epinicion over all our Enemies, *The sting of Death is sin, and the strength of Sin is the Law*; but thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ, *1 Cor. 15. 56, 57.*

Then for his Love to the Holy Spirit of God; it is too well known that the *Socinians* deny his Deity, and say, That the Holy Spirit is nothing separate from the Word; so that we need not to Baptize in his Name, to praise him in our Doxology, or to pray to him, *Come Holy Ghost Eternal God, &c.* Our natural Reason and Faith in God, makes the assistance of any other Spirit needless; and why then should we wait on the Spirit of God any longer, or believe that God will give any other Spirit to them that ask it? Is there no other Spirit but that which works in the Children of Disobedience? Are not some Souls an Habitation of God through the Spirit? Read we not of the Spirit of the Son, *Gal. 4. 6.* that helps our Infirmities? Do we not read of the divers Gifts of the Spirit, and that it is Christ's Vice-Roy, as I may say, to preside over his Church to the World's end? And is there no Love, no Obedience due to his Spirit, but we must join with the *Socinians* to pluck the Holy Ghost from his Throne.

2. As for his enlarged Charity to his Brethren, what love doth he manifest to the Church of God, that hath been founded on this Rock of the Confession of *St. Peter, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God*; when by his Principles they are proclaimed to be Idolaters, as worshipping a Creature besides the Creator; and giving him and the Holy Spirit, which by his Maxims are not God by nature, the same Divine Honour which is due to God only.

And as to the Church of *England* particularly, it hath been declared how contrary his Opinions are to her avowed Doctrines, more especially his Charity to the Convocation of the Clergy at *Westminster*, whom he condemns to be too stiff to their Constitutions, when he says, *All the World expected a Condescension from them*, is not very large. It was no very good Opinion that he conceived of them, when he thought to present his **Naked Gospel** to them, as if they would have lain in love with its Nakedness. And the truth is, they saw so many

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

shameful and scandalous Pamphlets demanding Alterations in our Constitutions and Doctrines, and a Toleration of Latitudinarian Principles, that though they were willing to make some moderate Concessions, yet when they perceived there would be no end of demanding such Alterations as they could not consent to, they thought it fit to maintain their ground, and not give way to unreasonable Proposals; such as these which the Doctor now makes, for a Toleration of the *Socinian* Heresie.

As for his Charity to the *Oxford* Convocations, the Reflections made on them in his Vindication, which hath been already considered, do discover that his Charity begins and ends at home, and is confined only to Men of his own Perswasion. I think I do not conjecture amiss, if I say, that he hath the same enlarged Charity for usas *Smalcinus* had, who concludes his Book *De Divinitate Christi* thus: *I doubt not to affirm confidently, That none of those who believe Jesus Christ to be God of himself, and to have Divine Power, can by any means have certain hope of Eternal Life, by vertue of his Opinion concerning Christ.* And such is the Charity of this Author to all that profess Christ to be their Saviour, and say, *Thou art the King of Gory, O Christ: Thou art the everlasting Son of the Father.*

If this were the Doctor's design in writing his *Naked Gospel*, I shall conform to the Apostle who enjoyns, *That if an Angel from Heaven should teach what is so opposie to the Gospel, which the Church in all Ages hath received and believed, he deserves an Anathema.*

Thus at last we are like to see a thorough Reformation of the glorious Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, even such as we saw of the once Flourishing Church of *England*, under the Government of the most Religious King and Martyr *Charles the First*: It was reformed first by a *Presbyterian* Parliament, which took away her *Bishops* and *Liturgy*; then by an *Independent Army*, that devoured her *Lands* and *Revenues*; then by an *Inspired General*, which brought in a Toleration of all sorts of *Enthusiasts*; and after sundry Revolutions, by a *Naked Rump*, which if God alone had not prevented, it would have left us all in Confusion.

Thus the Gospel which spread so far and wide under the Ministry of our Saviour and his Apostles, was first reformed by a Juncture of *Gnosticks*, *Nicolaitans*, and *Ebionites*, who mixt the *Jewish* Opinions and Observations with the pure Ordinances of the Gospel, and would equal *Moses* with Christ: then by the *Samosatenians* and *Arians*, who robbed him of that which he thought no Robbery, to assume to himself (*i. e.*) to be equal with God. Then by *Mabomet*, that great Impostor, who preferred himself above our Saviour, drawing all Sects into

a Body under himself. And now, after various Revolutions, by the **Naked Gospel**, which proclaims our Saviour a meer Man, as *Moses* and other Messengers of God were: to whom therefore some already do, and the rest of the *Socinians* ought by their Principles, to deny any Religious Worship; which by their own Confession is due to God only, and to no Creature whatsoever. And who can foresee with what Viperous Monsters the **Naked Gospel** is now pregnant! which begin to eat through the Bowels of that Church wherein they have been nourished; and proclaim Liberty to all sort of Heresies and Blasphemies, against the Son of God, and the Spirit of Grace, as the Apostle speaks, *Heb. 10. 28. Trampling under foot the Son of God, and doing despite to the Spirit of Grace.* When one Pamphlet proclaims the Holy Ghost Dethron'd, another, *The Triple God Buried*, and the Doctrine of the Trinity is a Popish Antichristian Diabolical Doctrine; these dreadful Alarms from the Bottomless Pit, should awaken all good Christians, unanimously to Invoke the Ever Blessed Trinity to arise and plead its own Cause, against such as daily Blaspheme them.

The loud Blasphemies of these *Philistines* against not only the *Israel* of God, but the God of *Israel*, hath called me forth to bid Defiance to this *Goliath*, though armed only with a Stone and a Sling: not doubting but there are many Worthies in our *Israel*, who will appear, and do wonderful things: All that I intended was to discover where this Adversary lay hid, under the usual Disguise of the Old Serpent, that mostily appears as an *Angel of Light*, that he may with less suspicion effect his Works of Darkness: and I doubt not, but the Church of Christ hath still such good Angels ministering to her, before whom such Angels of Satan shall flee, and fall as Lightning.

The *Rabbies* say, *That on the Stone wherewith David slew Goliath, the Characters of the Messiah were engraven.* I shall sling a Stone or two in the Name of the *Messiah*, our Blessed Saviour, against those *Philistines* that have blasphemed that Name, and commit the success of them to the All-disposing Providence of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

The first Argument that I shall urge, is the Harmony of the Old and New Testament, which speaks of the Deity of the *Messias*, and apply it to our Saviour.

The second is drawn from the Doctrine and Faith of such eminent Fathers and Martyrs as suffered for that Faith.

The third from those Judgments of God executed on those who in their several Ages openly opposed that Faith, which may serve as Examples to deter others from tempting Christ, lest they be destroyed as those were, of whom the Apostle speaks, *1 Cor. 10. 9.* From which

Premi-

Premises we may rightly infer an Equality of Nature and Power, in the Father and the Son, and conclude the same Honour and Worship due to both. When *Arcadius*, an *Arian* Emperor, assumed his Son to a Partnership in the Empire, the good Bishop (St. *Ambrose*, as I remember) addressing himself to *Arcadius*, humbled himself with all due Obedyance, but took no notice of his Son *Honorius*, at which the Emperor manifesting his displeasure, the good Bishop took occasion to tell him, *That if he were offended at the disrespect shewn to his Son, he might consider, that the God of Heaven might be more justly displeased with them that neglected to honour his Son; which I leave you to apply.*

Some *Socinians* deny our Saviour any Worship, and others grant him only a *Deiæ*, such an inferior Honor as the Papists do their Saints, not that Divine Worship which properly belongs to the Deity.

It is generally agreed by the *Socinians*, to make the Holy Sripture Judge of this great Controversy, concerning the Godhead of our Saviour; but they would have Reason to be Judge of the fence of the Scripture: and to this we would appeal, if they would not seek little Evasions from Particles, and Criticisms of their own inventions, against the plain Letter of the Scripture; for *Smalsius*, one of their best Champions, says, *Ludum & jocum è Scripturis facere pronunciant qui abque necessitate a quæw discedunt.* They do but make sport of the Scripture, that depart from the Letter of it; when therefore the Scriptures do declare our Blessed Saviour to be the Creator of all things visible and invisible.

Joh. 1.  
Col. 1. 16.  
Heb. 1.

Which must be understood not of the new Creation only, as the *Socinians* affirm, to evade the Testimony of St. *John*, ch. 1. but of the whole Creation; for the Angels which kept their purity and station, needed not a new Creation; when he is declared to be God over all, blessed for ever; when he is called the true God; and Col. 2. 9. *In whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily*; that is, really and fully: That Christ says of himself, *Before Abraham was I am*: That he speaks of the Glory which he had with the Father before the World was; *That God was manifested in the flesh. That God purchased the Church with his own blood.* And hereby we perceive the Love of God, because he laid down his Life for us; and we are still looking for the appearance of the great God, and our Saviour, Jesus Christ: (And) being exegerical the words (the Great God) shewing his Essence, and that of our Saviour his Office, *That all men should honour the Son as they honour the Father.* And to omit many others, he that Christ says of himself, *I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last*; which none but God could say.

1 Joh. 5. 20.

Joh. 8. 58.

Joh. 17. 5.

1 Tim.

Acts 20. 28.

1 Joh. 3. 16.



## The Naked Gospel.

107

What is it but to Play with the Scriptures, after all these express significations of his Eternal Deity, to deny it? And because the best Interpretation of the Scripture is to be found in the Harmony and Agreement, or the Analogy of the Old and New Testament; the best Confutation of the *Socinian*, and consequently the best Confirmation of the received Opinion of the Eternal Deity of the Son of God, may be demonstrated from those places in the Old Testament, which speaking of our Saviour as the *Messias*, and attributing to him the very Essence, Names, and Properties of the Supreme God, are in the New Testament appropriated to our Blessed Saviour, who therefore in divers places appeals to the Prophecies that went before concerning him, in the Law of *Moses*, in the *Psalms* and *Propheets*; to them we will appeal, and search the Scripture, because they testify of him.

At the Transfiguration of our Saviour, *Matth. 17.* it is said, *There appeared together with Peter, James and John, Moses and Elias; Ut lex & Prophetæ cum Evangelio congruentes sempiternum Dei filium quem annuntiaverant revelarent:* That the Law and the Prophets conspiring with Christ and his Evangelists, might declare the Eternal Son of God whom they had foretold, and were to preach to the World. See *St. Ambrose ad Gratian. 59.* and *St. Aug. ad Catechum. c. 6.*

This the Author of the *Naked Gospel* might have observed from his own Quotation of *Justin Martyr's* words to *Triphon the Jew*, *P. 31.* *I shall not prove, saith Just. Mar. that Christ is God, otherwise than by proving that this is the Christ, and that it was foretold that he should be such.*

The same course doth our Country-man *Bradwardine* take, speaking of the Trinity, &c. *p. 29.* he confidently affirms, *That there is not one substantial Article of the Christian Faith, which God had not solemnly foretold and revealed by his Propheets, and that in so plain a manner that if any Philosopher, as a Lover and Enquirer after Truth, should duly consider what is written in the Old Testament, he must become a Christian:* As he observes many of the Fathers who were such Philosophers, were persuaded to be.

Such were *Justine Martyr, Clemens Alex. Tertull. Origen*, and many others, who from the Schools of *Plato*, and some Traditions which he had received from the ancient *Jews*, were prepared, upon reading of the Old Testament, to imbrace the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, because they agreed with the Gospel preached by our Saviour.

*Hornbeck* in his Sum of Controversies, tells us, *That the Disciples of Mahomet do confess, that if they believed St. Paul's Epistles to be Canonical,*

*An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,*

*cal*, (as we do) they must believe the Divinity of Christ: Therefore in their Disputes with Christians concerning the Deity of Christ, they decline the Authority of St. Paul's Epistles, saying, *They were adulterated by the Christians.* That Testimony which Pliny gives to Trajan concerning the Christians, that they did *carmen dicere Christo tanquam Deo*; sing Praises to Christ as their God: coming from an Heathen is the more firm, and it cannot be denied.

The Christians who suffered under the Heathen Persecutors, suffered for their belief of the Eternal Deity of our Saviour; for their demand of them was, *Nega Deum incende Testamentum*; Deny your God, burn your Testaments: which implies, that they believed that Christ was God, and that their Testaments bore witness to the same. Yet their answer was, *Christianus sum Christum verum Deum agnosco & adoro*; I am a Christian, I acknowledge and worship Christ as the true God. See the *Tripartite History of the Persecution by the Vandals.*

And now I shall compare those Testimonies in the Old and New Testament which do prove, that our Saviour was the Eternal Son of God, and only premise, that if any one of those Scriptures which speak of the Eternal God in the Old Testament, be rightly applied to our Saviour in the New, that then he is that Eternal God: To this therefore I apply myself, desiring the Reader to bear in mind, that whatever from the Old Testament is in the New Testament accommodated to Christ by himself, or his Apostles, is as true, and to be believed as much as any other part of the Gospel.

The first Scripture that I shall compare is that of *Moses, Exod. 9. 1.* and *Exod. 20. 1.* with *Heb. 11. 25, 26.* from which places it is thus argued:

He to whom the People of *Israel* were a peculiar People, whom by the hands of *Moses* he brought out of *Egypt*; for whose sake *Moses* chose to suffer affliction with them, rather than to enjoy the Crown of *Pharaoh*: He was the God of *Israel*, but our Saviour Christ was he whose peculiar People they were, therefore, &c. This is applied to Christ, *Heb. 11. 24.* By Faith *Moses* refused to be called the Son of *Pharaoh's* Daughter, and chose rather to suffer affliction with the People of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of Sin for a season; esteeming the Reproach of Christ greater Riches than the Treasures of *Egypt*: Here the affliction of the People of God is called the reproach of Christ, his therefore was that People, and them he brought out of *Egypt*, and therefore he is that God. The Apostle St. *Jude*, v. 5. speaks to this purpose, *That the Lord, when he saved the people out of Egypt, afterward destroyed*

*destroyed*

## The Naked Gospel.

109

stroyed them that believed not. Compare *Psal. 45. v. 6, 7.* with *Heb. 1. 8.* Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the scepter of thy kingdom is a right scepter: He whose Throne is for ever and ever is God; but Christ's Throne is for ever and ever, therefore he is God. Both these Propositions are express Scripture.

The next Scripture shall be that of *Isai. 7. 14.* *A Virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son, and his name shall be called Emanuel;* compared with *Mat. 1. 23.* *All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken (viz.) Isai. 7. 14.) by the Prophet, saying, Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Emanuel.*

There is an Objection cast in our way which must be removed, before we proceed: *Object.* It is said, *Matth. 1. 21.* *The Angel of the Lord which appeared to Joseph, told him that he should call his name Jesus;* How then was this of the Prophet fulfilled, *They shall call his name Emanuel?*

*Ans.* That Names are of two sorts, some for distinction of Persons, as proper Names, others serve for Description of the Nature or Offices of a Person; in the first respect he is called Jesus, a Saviour, there being no other Saviour but he; for there is no other name given to man, whereby he may be saved. The other of Emanuel, describes his Nature, what he should be, viz. *God with us, God manifested in the flesh:* So the same Prophet; *Isai. 9. 6.* *His name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, &c.* And *Jer. 23. 6.* *This is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.* And *Luke 1. 35.* *That which is born of thee shall be called the Son of God.* And it is observed, that both the word *קבו* in the Old Testament, and *καὶ ἐν* in the New, do signify to be, as well as to be called. *Justin Martyr, Tertullian,* and other Ancients, solved this Objection made by the Jews, *Venit Emanuel quia venit quod Emanuel significat;* The Emanuel is come, because he is come who was signified by that name, *God with us;* not only to reconcile us to God, but to be God Incarnate.

The Argument then is this: *Emanuel* is *ὁ θεός*, God in the Divine Essence; Christ is *Emanuel*, therefore he is God in the Divine Essence. That the word God is to be understood of the most High God, the Socinians grant: But *Crellinus* objects, that the word *est* should be added, and so the meaning is, *God is with us.* But when *St. Matthew* expounds the name without that Addition, there is great Reason to reject it: and if that had been the meaning of the Holy Ghost, in the name as given by the Prophet, *St. Matthew* would not have omitted it, it being of great concern to the Glory of God, and the Instruction of the Church. The meaning of the Name therefore is not *God is with us*, (i. e.) as says *Crellinus*, to help and assist us: but Christ

is God with us; for the name *Emanuel* being put into English, and applied unto Christ, it will appear whether St. *Matthew* or *Crellius* gives the best Interpretation: This is St. *Matthew's* sence, *Christ is God with us*; (i. e.) God and Man. And this is *Crellius* his Non-sence, *Christ God with Man is*. Is not this to add to, and alter the sence of the Scripture?

*Malach. 3. 1.* compared with *Matth. 11. 10.* *Behold, I send my Messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple*: This is he saith St. *Matthew*, of whom it is written, *Behold I send my Messenger before thy face, &c.*

It is agreed that *John the Baptist* was this Messenger spoken of; and the Argument is this: He before whom *John Baptist* was to be sent to prepare his way, is the God of *Israel*, but Christ is he before whom *John Baptist* was to be sent, &c. therefore Christ is the God of *Israel*.

The first Proposition is proved by *Malachy*, where he that speaks is called the God of *Israel*, and Lord of Hosts: This *Socius* grants. The second Proposition is proved by St. *Matthew*, applying it to Christ, *This is he of whom it is written, &c.*

The Sum of what is objected to this Argument is, *That the Text in Malachy is corrupted, and instead of reading, He shall prepare the way before me; it should be read, He shall prepare the way before thee.* But then how comes it to pass, that no one Copy of that of *Malachy*, or this in St. *Matthew* reads otherwise than we do? He will not say they are all corrupted; and we say none are corrupted. But they ask, *How is it that what Malachy reads in the first Person, He shall prepare the way before me, Christ renders in the second Person, He shall prepare the way before thee?*

*Ans.* This Objection will improve our Argument; for when *Malachy* says, *He shall prepare the way before me*; which is spoken of the God of *Israel*, and our Saviour renders it, *He shall prepare the way before thee*, and applies it to himself, this proves that Christ was that God of *Israel* who spake in *Malachy*; and so proves the Identity of the Essence of God the Father and the Son. Moreover, by comparing this place of *Malachy* with the Interpretation which our Saviour gives of it in St. *Matthew*, we infer from *Malachy* the Unity of the Essence of the God of *Israel* and Christ; and from that in *Matthew* we learn a distinction of Persons, which had not been so intelligible, if Christ had not changed the first Person, or the word *my*, into the second Person, or the word *thy*, in St. *Matth.*

*Deut. 6. 13.* compared with *Matth. 4. 10.* the words are the same, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* The

Argu-

## The Naked Gospel.

111

Argument is this: He that is to be worshipped and served with Divine Worship is the God of *Israel*: Christ is to be worshipped and served with Divine Worship, therefore Christ is the God of *Israel*. The first Proposition is express Scripture: the second is granted by the Socinians; therefore the Conclusion is undeniable.

*Crellius*, when he would prove that Christ is not the true God, from *Joh. 20.* *This is life eternal to know thee only the true God*, says, *That the word only excludes all others from being the true God.* *Schicktingius* is of another mind, and says, *That this particle only, when it is spoken of God, doth not exclude those that depend on God in the thing spoken of.* Now if *Crellius* speaks the truth, then Christ is not to be worshipped, because the word *only* excludes him: If *Schicktingius* speaks the truth, then Christ may be the true God, because the word *only* doth not exclude him. *Volkelius* says, *That seeing Christ is subordinate to God, in worshipping of Christ we worship God who hath given him so great Power and Dignity.*

*Ans.* This is against the Command that excludes all others, for if Christ be a Man, wholly distinguished from the Father by nature, if he be a Creature, though honoured with the name of God, as others have been, this Precept forbids us to worship him, as much as to worship any other Creature.

That which they farther object, *That this Precept belongs to the Old Testament, and was given before Christ had a being*, is absurd; for if there be any Moral Precepts of perpetual Obligation, this is one: besides, when Christ used this Precept, he was then in being; and by a Voice from Heaven was proclaimed to be the Son of God. So that the Socinians must wholly deny Divine Worship to Christ, or else are guilty of Idolatry, in worshipping a Creature.

The like Argument we have *Isa. 42. 8.* where God declares, *That he will not give his glory to another*, (i. e.) the Praise, Adoration, and Worship which is due to him alone, may not be given to any other Angels or Men. The Argument is this: God will not give his Glory or Divine Worship to another; but he hath given it to Christ, therefore Christ is not another.

To this they say, *That God intended by this Declaration to exclude Graven Images, which are immediately expressed*, Neither my praise to graven Images; he doth not say, *He will not give it to any who have their dependance on him, and are subordinate to him.* As if the word *another* did exclude only Graven Images; or as if all other things had not their dependance on him, which yet are all excluded.

And it is observable, that in this Chapter mention is made of Christ; so *v. 6.* *I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold*



## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

thy hand, and keep thee, and give thee for a covenant to the people, a light to the Gentiles; this is spoken of Christ, *Luke 2. 32.* To open the blind Eyes, to bring out the Prisoners from the Prison, and them that sit in Darkness out of the Prison-house; see *Luke 4. 18.* So after the Text, *Behold I declare new things, (viz.) by Christ the word.* And *v. 13.* *The Lord shall go forth as a mighty man— he shall prevail against his enemies.* All this the Gospel shews was performed by Christ; now this Glory and Worship being given to Christ, it follows, that he also is the *Jehovah*, the God of *Israel*.

*Isa. 45. 23.* compared with *Rom. 14. 10.* *Look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else— Unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear:* this is applied to Christ. *Rom. 14. 11.* *We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ; for it is written, As I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God:* Which plainly infers that Christ is that God.

*Psal. 102. 25, &c.* compared with *Heb. 1.* The Apostle distinguisheth between holy Men that spake and the Son of God; the *Psalmist* says, *Thou hast laid the foundations of the earth:* which the Apostle applies to Christ, therefore he is that God. And to that Son it is that it is said, *Thou Lord hast laid the foundations of the earth, &c.* I have seen an ancient Saxon Manuscript, now in Print, which read in the fourth Commandment, *Jesum Christ made the Heavens and the Earth.*

*Psal. 97. 7.* compared with *Heb. 1. 6.* The *Psalmist's* words are, *Worship him all ye God or Angels;* so *Elohim* signifies. The Argument is: He whom all the Angels are commanded to Worship in this *Psal*, is the God of *Israel*; Christ is he whom the Angels are there commanded to worship, therefore Christ is the God of *Israel*.

The first Proposition is in the *Psal*, which speaketh of the Lord of the whole Earth; so the God of *Israel* is often stiled, *Jos. 3. 11. Zach. 4. 14. Mich. 4. 13.* The second Proposition is evident in *Heb. 1.* where this Worship is applyed to Christ, *Let all the Angels of God worship him:* A Question here is raised, Whether the words of the *Psalmist*, and the Author to the *Hebrews*, speak of the same Person, or of another? If of the same, then is that Person *Jehovah* the Supreme God; if of another, then it is a false Exposition, when that which is spoken of one Person in the *Psal* by the Holy Spirit, is applyed to another by Men. He therefore whom the Angels are to worship, is the only begotten Son of God, and *Jehovah* the Lord of the whole Earth; for to this purpose is the *Psalmist* quoted, to prove that Christ is to be worshipped by the very Angels: which could not be to the purpose, if he were not the same that is spoken of in that *Psal*, (*viz.*) *The most high God.* *Psal.*

## The Naked Gospel.

113

*Psal.* 68. 18. compared with *Eph.* 4. 8. *Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, and received gifts for men:* Which the Psalmist speaks of God, and the Apostle applies to Christ, therefore he is God.

*Psal.* 24. 1. compared with *1 Cor.* 10. 26. *He whose is the earth and the fulness thereof, is the great Jehovah:* but of Christ it is said, *His is the earth and the fulness thereof;* therefore he is the Lord *Jehovah*. The name *Jehovah* is in the Text of the Psalmist, which proves the first Proposition: and in the Apostle *1 Cor.* 10. this is applied to Christ who is particularly denoted by the name *ως ἐστιν*, throughout the New Testament; and by the Apostle *1 Cor.* 8. 6. and *Chap.* 12. 5. *Eph.* 4. 5. And the *Arians* grant, *that he was the Creator of all things;* and therefore the Earth and the Fulness thereof belongs to him; he therefore is the *Jehovah*, or Supreme God.

*Isa.* 35. 4. compared with *Matth.* 11. 5. The Prophet says, *Your God shall come and save you; then shall the eyes of the blind be opened:* This Prophecy was fulfilled by our Saviour, *Mat.* 11. 5. whence the Argument is thus formed: That God who at his coming was to open the eyes of the Blind, &c. was the God of Israel: Christ is that God who at his coming did open the eyes, &c. therefore Christ is the God of Israel. Note, That by *your God* is meant the God promised to Israel, the *ἐσθλὸς θεός*, for of him was the question, *Art thou he that should come?* v. 3.

*Isa.* 8. 13. compared with *Rom.* 9. 30. and *1 Pet.* 2. 3. The words are, *Sanctify the Lord God of Hosts himself, &c.* The Argument is thus: He that should be a Stone of Stumbling and a Rock of Offence, is the Supreme God; but Christ is that Rock and Stone, &c.

*Isa.* 4. 3. 5. 10. compared with *Matth.* 3. 3. 5. 14. and *1 Pet.* 1. 24. The words are, *The voice of one crying in the wilderness:* This Cryer was *John Baptist*, *Matth.* 3. 3. and he pointed to that Lord whose ways he was to prepare by preaching the Doctrine of Repentance; and that Lord was Christ to whom *St. John Baptist* bore witness, *This is the Lamb of God.* In *Isa.* 4. v. 5. *The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it:* This was fulfilled *Job.* 1. 14. *The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory.* And *John* 2. 11. *He manifested his glory, and his Disciples believed in him.* And the Gospel is called, *The gospel of the glory of Christ,* *2 Cor.* 4. 4. That which is added in the Prophet, v. 8. *The word of our God endureth for ever;* that is, the word of Christ, of which himself said, *Matth.* 24. 35. *Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away.* It follows in the Prophet, v. 10. *Behold your God;* to which that of *St. John Baptist* answereth, *Behold the Lamb of God.* From these Premises it follows, that Christ was that God foretold by the Prophet, and pointed

# An Answer to a late Treatise, Entitled,

pointed at by *John Baptist*. The like is *Mal.* 3. 1. compared with *Matth.* 11. 10. of which before.

*Iſa.* 6. compared with *Job.* 12. 41. *I ſaw the Lord ſitting on a high throne, &c.* To this *St. John* refers, Theſe things ſaid *Iſaiab* as when he ſaw his Glory. The Argument is this: He whoſe glory *Iſaiab* ſaw was the God of *Iſrael*; but *Jeſus* is he whoſe glory *Iſaiab* ſaw, therefore he is the God of *Iſrael*. Both theſe Propositions are expreſs Scripture.

*Jer.* 23. 6. compared with *1 Cor.* 1. 30. The Argument is this: He whoſe name is, *The Lord our Righteouſneſs*, is the God of *Iſrael*; but the King *Meſſias* the branch of *David*, Chriſt is he whoſe name is, *The Lord our Righteouſneſs*. The major is granted, the minor appears from the conſideration of that Deliverance and Salvation there ſpoken of, which is ſpiritual; and Chriſt alone is the Author of this Redemption or Salvation, *Acts* 4. 10. *Neither is there ſalvation in any other; for (1 Cor. 1. 30.) of God he is made to us wiſdom and righteouſneſs, ſanctification and redemption*: He then that is *the Lord our Righteouſneſs*, is *Jeſus*.

*Iſa.* 41. 4. compared with *Revel.* 1. 11, 17. and 2. 8. and *Chap.* 22. 13. The words are, *I am the firſt and the laſt*; which are applyed to our Saviour, *Revel.* 1. 11, 17. The Argument is this: He that is the firſt and the laſt, is the moſt high God; Chriſt is the firſt and the laſt, therefore he is the moſt high God. And doubtleſs our Saviour would never have aſſumed this Title, ſo derogatory to God, ſo dangerous to his Church, if he had been but a Creature, as the *Socinians* ſay.

*Pſal.* 24. with *1 Cor.* 2. 8. The *Meſſias* in the *Pſalmiſt* is called the King of Glory. *Liſt up your heads O Gates, and the King of Glory ſhall come in.* This King of Glory is called, *The Lord ſtrong and mighty, and the Lord of Hoſts*; (i. e.) the moſt high God: And as this was Prophesied of Chriſt, ſo it is applyed unto Chriſt, whom the Apoſtle calls the Lord of Glory; and as our Church, *Thou art the King of Glory, O Chriſt*; therefore Chriſt is that Lord, ſtrong and mighty, and the Lord of Hoſts, the moſt high God.

*Zach.* 11. 13. compared with *Matth.* 27. 9. The words are, *The Lord ſaid unto me, Caſt it unto the Potter, a goodly price that I was prized at of them, &c.* *Matth.* 27. 9. *Then was fulfilled that which was ſpoken by the Prophet Jeremiah, ſaying, And they took the price, &c.* The Argument is this: He that in *Zachariah* was valued at thirty Peices of Silver, &c. was the Lord God of *Iſrael*; Chriſt was he that was thus valued, therefore he is the God of *Iſrael*.

*Zach.*

## The Naked Gospel.

115

*Zach. 12. 10.* compared with *Job. 19. 37.* *Revel. 1. 7.* The words are, *They shall look upon me whom they have pierced, &c.* So *St. John*, and another Scripture says, *They shall look on him whom they have pierced.* The Argument is this: *He* whom the House of *David*, and *Inhabitants of Jerusalem*, are said to look on, and to have pierced, is the most high God; *Christ* is he whom they should look on, and whom they had pierced, therefore *Christ* is the most high God. It is evident, that he who spake this in *Zachariab*, was *Jehovah*; that would pour out the Spirit of Grace and Supplication; which makes the first Proposition undeniable, and the Apostle confirms the second; so both are undeniable.

*Numb. 21. 5, 6.* compared with *1 Cor. 10. 9.* *He for tempting of whom the Israelites perished in the wilderness, was the God of Israel:* For tempting of *Christ* the *Israelites* perished in the Wilderness, therefore *Christ* is that God of *Israel*.

*Isa. 52. 67.* compared with *Rom. 10. 15.* The words are, *Therefore my people shall know my Name; therefore they shall know in that day, that I am he that doth speak, behold it is I. How beautiful on the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth glad tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Sion, Thy God reigneth.* This is a Prophecy of *Christ*, and a certain time is spoken of his appearance, *In that day they shall know that I am he;* *Ecce adsum, Behold it is I.* The Argument is this: He that says, *Behold it is I,* or *Ecce adsum*, is the God of *Israel*; but it is *Christ* that says it in the Prophet, therefore he is that God of *Israel*.

*Socinus* grants this place concerns the time of *Christ's* coming, but would have it to refer to the Deliverance from *Babylon*: But the words of the Apostle, *Rom. 10. 15.* *O how beautiful are the feet, &c.* plainly refer to the Apostles that preached the Gospel, which contains the glad Tidings of Peace, which the Prophet spake of with great admiration, *Behold, thy King reigneth!* And *Socinus* grants, that the Deliverance from *Babylon* was but a Type of that by *Christ*; the truth or true Deliverance intended, was that by *Christ*, the God of *Israel*.

*Isa. 60. 1.* compared with *Eph. 5. 14.* The words are, *Arise, arise, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee:* The Apostle gives the meaning of this Scripture, *Eph. 5. 14.* *Arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light;* which he thus prefaceth, wherefore he says, (*i. e.*) the Holy Ghost in the Scripture; and that *Christ* is spoken of, appears from *v. 3.* *And the Gentiles shall come to thy light;* agreeable to, *A light to lighten the Gentiles.* The Argument then is: He that was to enlighten the People of *Israel*, and to be a Light to the *Gentiles*, was the God of *Israel*; but *Christ* was to be a light to ligh-

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

*ten the Gentiles, and to be the glory of his people Israel, therefore Christ is the God of Israel.*

*Isa. 54. 5.* compared with *Matth. 9. 15. and 25. 1. 1 Job. 3. 29. 2 Cor. 11. 12.* The words are, *For thy Maker is thy Husband, the Lord of Hosts is his name.* The Argument is this: The Husband of the Church is the God of *Israel*; Christ is the Husband of the Church, therefore Christ is the God of *Israel*. The Prophet affirms the first Proposition, the second is proved by our Saviour, *Mat. 9. 15.* where he calls himself *the Bridegroom*; and *chap. 25. 1.* in the Parable of the ten Virgins, *He is the Bridegroom*; *Eph. 5.* the Apostle speaks of Christ and his Church as of Husband and Wife: This Union was prophesied of by *Hosea, chap. 2. 16.* *In that day thou shalt call me Ishi, my Husband*; for *v. 19. I will betroth thee to me for ever, &c.*

*1 Kings 8. 39. and 2 Cron. 6. 30.* compared with *Revel. 2. 23.* The words are, *Thou only knowest the hearts of the sons of men.* All the Churches shall know that I am he that searcheth the Hearts and Reins, to give to every Man according to his works. The Argument is this: The God of *Israel* only knows the hearts of Men; Christ knows the hearts of Men, therefore Christ is the God of *Israel*. Both these Propositions are express Scriptures, therefore the Consequence is undeniable.

*Isa. 63. 1.* compared with *Revel. 19. 13, &c.* The words are, *Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments— I that spake in righteousness, mighty to save.* St. *John* speaking of Christ says, *He was clothed with a vesture dyed in blood, and his name is called the Word of God*: Now the Prophet speaks of the God of *Israel*, and St. *John* applies it to Christ, as by the Context in both doth appear, therefore Christ is the God of *Israel*.

These among many others may suffice concerning the Harmony of both Testaments; to which I may add those express Testimonies concerning the whole Trinity in the New Testament: The first that I shall mention is such, of which I may say, as the Doctor doth of his Fundamentals, *p. 43. c. 1.* That if all the rest of the Scripture were lost, this alone would be sufficient to confute the Socinians, (viz.) *Mat. 28. 19. Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*; where we have three distinct Persons of equal Dignity and Power, to whom under the same Name we dedicate ourselves, and promise Worship and Obedience.

The Socinians are not ashamed to say, That *this place is added by Athanasius, or some of his Perswasion*; though not only the practice of the Apostles and the Primitive Fathers may evince the contrary; but it is read in all the Greek Copies, the Syriack and Ethiopick; and *Ignatius*,



*tius, Tertullian,* and other Fathers have quoted and expounded this Text: and the Socinians retain it in their German Edition of that Gospel, An. 1630.

2ly, They object, *That to be baptized in the Name of any, doth not conclude him to be God, seeing the Israelites were baptized into Moses, and some Disciples into the Baptism of John, Acts 19. 3.*

*Ans.* To be baptized into *Moses*, was to be baptized by the Ministry or Hand of *Moses*, as the Syriack Version reads: and hence St. Paul says, *That none of the Corinthians were baptized in his name, 1 Cor. 1. 14, 15.* lest any should infer, that he expected Obedience from them: And it is one thing to be baptized in the Name of *John*, and another to be baptized by the Administration of St. *John's* Baptism; the import of Baptism is to believe as we have been baptized, and to Worship as we believe, i. e. The Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

There are many other Scriptures that confirm the Doctrine of the Trinity, in the Judgment of our Divines, as *Job. 15. 26.* *When the Comforter is come, whom I will send from the Father;* where we have the Father from whom, the Son by whom, and the Person of the Holy Ghost that is sent. So also *2 Cor. 13. 13.* in that Benediction, *The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Fellowship of the Holy Ghost,* we have a plain distinction of three Persons, the Authors of the same Grace. So also *1 Cor. 12. 5, 6.* *And there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit and diversities of administrations, but the same Lord, and there are diversities of operations, but the same God;* where we have three Persons and but one God.

It is evident from these and many other Scriptures, that by Concession of the *Arians*, our Saviour had the Divine Attributes of Omnipotence and Omniscience communicated to him; and if these were imparted to him by his Father, it is not against reason that that other Attribute of Eternity might be also; for to be Omnipotent and Omniscient, implies an Infinity as the properties of the Eternal God; nor can our Saviour be thought less than Infinite, when we believe that he hears the Prayers, searcheth the Hearts, and knows the Thoughts of all Men, and shall come to be the Judge of all, without which Attributes he could not judge rightly. The Creation and Conservation of all things do prove the same; for he that made all things is God: And so doth his being the only Law-giver, and the only Judge, and to qualify him for these Offices he must be God; to bind our Consciences to his Laws, and to judge righteous Judgment, And shall not the Judge of all the Earth judge righteously? which none can do but the Omniscient and Omnipotent God.

*Esium*, one of the best School-men, asserts, *That no Creature can be so bigbly elevated, by a supernatural power, as to co-operate by way of a Physical Instrument in the Creation, because it is a property that belongs to such an Instrument to have something of its own, whereby to work disposiive for the effecting of the Creation; Whence, he says, no Creature can be assumed to the power of Creation, as a Physical Instrument, the nature of that Instrument still remaining.* And nothing can be the cause of Creation, which hath not an infinite Power, because by how much the Form to be produced is removed from the Power of Production, by so much a greater power is required in the Agent; so that for the production of something out of nothing, there is required an infinite Power, because the distance between something and nothing is infinite: so that our Saviour being (as the Scripture affirms) the Creator of the World, he is also God over all, blessed for ever.

Hence *Origen* against *Celsus* proves, *That God neither did, nor could make the World by any thing without himself,* (as the Angels of which it was discoursed) were, and hence he concludes, *That Christ by whom the World was made was God.* See also *Irenæus* l. 2. 55. and l. 4. c. 37.

*St. Peter* in *Epistle* 2. 2. 1. speaking of false Prophets that privily should bring in damnable Heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, says, *That they should bring upon themselves swift destruction.* And v. 3. *Their judgment lingereth not, and their damnation slumbreth not.* It may therefore be a good argument with many a person, not yet infected with such Heresies, to give a short Account of the manifest Judgments of God upon the chief Founders and Patrons of the *Arian* and *Socinian* Doctrines; for, for such Opinions of the Doctrines of the *Gnosticks*, *Cerintbus*, and *Ebion*, &c. which had infected the *Asian* Churches, and for the wicked Lives of such as entertained those Heretical Doctrines it was, that they had their Candle-stick removed, and were left in Darknes, and under the Dominion of *Mabomet* to this day.

*Olimpius*, an ancient *Arian* Bishop, publicly blasphemed our Saviour in a Bath, and suddenly felt as it were three Darts thrown at him by an Angel, which put him into a great Agony, whereof he died miserably.

*Greg. Nazianzen* reports the same of *Julian* the Apostate, who in his War against the *Persians*, felt a Dart thrown at him by an unknown Hand; which he pluckt out and cast it into the Air, with a *Vicisti Galilæi*; *Thou hast overcome me, O Galilean*: Of which that Father, *Orat.* 3. says, of such as still opposed the Deity of our Saviour, *Audite Angeli quorum Operâ Julianus extinctus est*: Hear the Angels by whose Assistance *Julian* was slain. *Platina* in the Life of *Anastasius* the Second.

*Nestorius,*

*Nestorius* who, as *Prateilus* says, affirmed, That Christ was *Dei ferus*, not *Deus*, and fancied two Natures in Christ; by the Council of *Ephesus*, *Cyril* of *Alexandria* being President, and the Emperor banished him, in which Banishment his Tongue rotted out of his Mouth, being eaten with Worms; and the Church passed this Sentence on him, *That he went from temporal Miseries to eternal Torments*, *Socrates*, l. 7. c. 33. *Evagrius*, l. 1. c. 7.

You have heard of the ignominious Death of *Arius* already, against whom Bishop *Alexander* prayed, *Si Arius cras in Synagoga introductetur nunc dimittas seruum tuum sin Ecclesie parias tolle Arium*. See *Atbanasius Epist. ad Serapion*, l. 7. c. 19.

*Paulus Orosius*, speaking of the *Goths* and *Vandals* who petitioned an *Arian* Emperor to send them some Christian Preachers, he sent them such as were infected with *Arianism*, and shortly after they made War against him, and slew him.

Under the Persecution of *Dioclesian*, the Hereticks that denied our Saviour's Deity, as the *Sabellians* and *Samosatenians*, with others had done, who were the Fathers of *Arius* his Heresie, raised another Persecution against the Orthodox, as cruel as that of the most cruel Persecutor; for *Donatus* having begun his Schism, which disturbed all *Africa*, where also the *Arian* Heresie prevailed, got many of that Opinion to joyn with him.

*Optatus Milevitanus*, speaking of those times, *Hist. Collationis Carthag.* says, *Credo nostros in refutandis Arianis totos fuisse*, p. 606. That the Orthodox were wholly employed in defending themselves against the *Arians*: We are assured by good History, that *Donatus* himself wrote a Book *de Spiritu Sancto*, agreeable to the Doctrine of *Arius*, as *Optatus*, and *St. Hierom*, and *St. August. ad Quod vult Deum*, do relate: They altered the Doxology, and made it run thus: *Glory be to the Father, in the Son, and by the Holy Ghost*; and taught, *that the Son was less than the Father, and the Holy Ghost less than the Son*. So that by the prevalence of the *Donatists*, who favoured all Sects and Heresies, to strengthen themselves against the *Catholicks*, great Cruelties were practised against them; many banished, some cruelly tortured and murdered; the *Jews*, *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Sabellians*, &c. all uniting under the *Donatists*. Both the Holy Sacraments grew into contempt, as they are now where the *Socinians* prevail: some were so prophane as to cast the consecrated Bread to their Dogs, which after they had eaten grew mad, and fell upon their Masters. *Theodore*t tells us, how they scoft at the consecrated Vessels, or rather at the Son of God, *Ecce quibus vasis sacrificatur Mariæ filio*, l. 3. c. 12. They were so numerous that they despised all the Emperor's Edicts that were published a-

gainst them, and affronted his Officers. But God punished them by their own inventions, giving them to a kind of Madness, which if ever appeared in the *Circumcellians*, that in their rage slew whomever they met without distinction, not sparing each other, and frequently destroyed themselves; no wonder therefore that they were cruel to others, being unmerciful to their own Souls. *Paulus Samosatenus* was banisht by *Aurelian*, for the disturbance made in his Dominions, at the Request of the Council that condemned him.

The *Arians* displaced *Maximus* Bishop of *Neapolis*, for not complying with their Doctrine, and placed one *Socimus* in his Bishoprick; *Maximus* keeps to his Office, until they cast him out by force; and then he denounced an *Anathema* against the Intruder *Socimus*, enters into his Office, and being to speak to the People, his Tongue failed him, and grew too big for his Mouth, so that he left the Church and People for that time; and being recovered, he assayed a second, and so a third time, but still found the same Judgment attended him, so that he was forced to forsake his usurped Dignity.

The famous St. *George*, whom the late Author of the Acts of the Great *Athanasius*, p. 8. so highly commends, as that he makes him the most skilful of all Mortals in those Questions, who was (he thinks) that Legendary Saint that slew the Dragon and delivered a Virgin; the Moral whereof, he says, was, *That Athanasius was the Dragon, and the Church of Alexandria the Virgin, which by his Learning and Piety he defended from the venomous breath of Athanasius*: But this was the Man that had been a Souldier, and in his latter days turn'd *Arian*; and when none else could be found to enter on the Bishoprick of *Athanasius*, St. *George* having favour of the *Arian* Party, presumed to Sequester him, but to the great dislike of the People, who after a short time fell on him, dragged him through the Streets of *Alexandria*, and slew him; yet the *Arians* accounted him for a Martyr, see *Epiphanius* *Heres.* 76.

*Sandius* gives a large account of this *George*, and says, *That the Turks accounted him a Prophet, and call him Gerges*, *Sandius* p. 246. says, *He was slain by a party of the Athanasians*. But the Ancient Historians say it was done by the barbarous *Greeks*, whose Temples he had destroyed. That infamous *Ecebolius* who so often changed his outward Profession, lived and died an *Arian*, *Sand. Append.* p. 32.

*Lelius Socinus*, Uncle to *Faufus*, was the first that revived the Heresie against the Blessed Trinity, a person of good Learning, and of a good Family, as *Andreas Dudithius* relates; he concealed his Opinions, only he was wont to insinuate them by way of Discourse, as if he did it for his own Information, but it was rather to seduce others, as *Dudithius*

*ditius* says, he attempted him. But *Sacius* his Nephew observes, That having collected his Papers, and made them ready to be published, he was *prematura morte extinctus*, (*viz.*) in the thirty seventh Year of his Life.

*Sandius*, p. 230. says, That *Leo*, the first Bishop of *Rome*, in the days of *St. Hilary*, was an *Arian*, opposing the Doctrine of the Trinity; for which *Hilary* l. 1. *ad Constantium*, reflects on him in these words, *Leo seviens circumit*. He came to a like end as *Arius* did, voiding his Entrails by a violent Dysentery, and miserably expired; the like he says of *Anastafius* another Bishop of *Rome*, p. 310.

The same Author p. 428. tells us of one *Gregorius Pauli* an *Arian*, who preaching at *Cracovia*, against the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Church of *St. Mary*, wherein he preached, was smote with Lightning: This *Paul* (saith he) wrote a Book, *De Antichristi Deo Trino & Uno*.

P. 419. He relates that famous Story of *Uladislaus* and *Humniades* his General, who having sworn to Articles of Peace with *Amurath*, they laying their hands on the Evangelists, and he on the *Alcoran*; Pope *Eugenius* perwaded them to make War against *Amurath*, notwithstanding their Oaths, from which he sent Cardinal *Julianus* to Absolve them, pretending they had no power to conclude a Peace without the Pope's approbation; whereupon they assaulted *Amurath* with a great Army, who being surprized, and trusting to the Articles of Peace, had made no great Provision for the War, was at first put to flight, but having gathered more Forces, he bids them Battle, and seeing the Banner of the Cross in his Enemy's Camp, he takes the Articles of Peace out of his Bosom, and says, O *Jesu Christ*, this is the Peace which they who glory in thy Name, confirmed with me by their Oaths, which they have perfidiously broken; if thou be a God, avenge this Perfidy: and renewing the Fight, routeth *Humniades*, and in the Flight *Uladislaus* is slain; and the Cardinal having hid himself, was discovered and slain; and seventy Ships destroyed in the *Hellspont*; which signal Providence was enough to convince a *Turk*, that Christ was God.

*Blandrata* a Physician, was for his Skill in that Science entertained by Prince *Radzivil*, who being a Protestant, *Calvin* wrote to him, advising him to beware of *Blandrata*, as a Man infected with the Error of *Servetus*: On this Information he was summon'd to a Meeting at *Pinkorve*, and being accused, he fraudulently subscribed his Belief of the Trinity, to keep up his Reputation with that Prince; but finding himself suspected, he gets into *Poland*, and for his Skill in Physick, was admitted as Physician to King *Stephen*; and having gotten Liberty and Power, he declared himself an *Anti-trinitarian*, and wrote and acted



## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

acted very much in defence of his Opinion; but was at length found dead in his Bed, his neck being broken: *Socinus*, to prevent the Scandal that might be taken from the unfortunate Death of a Patron of his Heresie, gave it out, That he was strangled in his Bed by a Kinsman, who being made his Heir, strangled him; that he might possess his Estate. We have only a Comment of his on *St. John*, chap. 1. which *Janus de Trinitate* and *Zaneb. de Tribus Elohim* do recite and confute.

*Lismaninus*, another *Anti-trinitarian*, was accused for being an *Arian*, by a Synod held at *Morden*, where getting off upon his false Protections, he was afterwards convicted of it at *Wodreslaw*, and drowned himself in a Well, as *Beza* in his 81st Epistle.

*Paulus Alciatus*, and *Bernardinus Ochinus*, who both wrote against the Trinity, did both turn *Turks*. *Beza* reports, that *Gentilis* being asked what became of his Friend and Companion *Paulus Alciatus*, answerd, That he was turned Turk. So *Beza's* Epistle 81.

*Puccius*, a Man of a Noble Family, but a wavering Judgment, for improving his Knowledge, came and studied a while in *Oxford*, where finding few Men of his mind, he went to *Basil*, and meeting with *Socinus*, after much Discourse with him, professed they could agree in nothing concerning Religion, but that there was a God. This was the Man that pleaded for a *Natural Faith*, (as our Doctor doth,) and other Wild Opinions; for which he was driven thence, and returned to *England*, where he (his Opinions being made known) was cast into Prison, and on his Release went into *Holland*, from whence he went to *Cracovia*, where he wrote a Book called, *The Bible Shut*; denying all Ordinances, Ministry, and Preaching till *Elias* should come and restore all things. His Reason was from the Apostacy of the Church; and he fancied that he was this *Elias*, and expected a Call from Heaven to Commissionate him. At length, God having in his just Judgment given him up to such strong Delusions, he meets with too *English* Men who came to *Poland*, who pretended to Revelations, and Converse with Angels; but one of them was a Papist, that acted a Mountebanck, and the other a Magician; with these he travels to *Prague*, where the Papist having insinuated himself with *Puccius*, perswaded him that he had a Revelation, that *Puccius* must turn Papist; which after a while he did, and was reconciled to the Church of *Rome*; but in a short time died a desperate Magician.

*Franciscus David* having long studied the *Socinian* Tenets, was at length convinced, That if *Christ* were a meer Man, he ought not to be Invocated and Adored as God. This troubled *Socinus*, as foreseeing what

what a Scandal it would bring on his Opinions, and therefore opposeth him with all his Industry, professing he could not account them Christians, that would not worship Christ, which Worship he endeavoured to prove due to him by the Scripture; but on his Supposition that Christ was a meer Man, he could not evince, for *Christianus Franken* took the part of *Francis David*, and confounded *Socinus* by his own Arguments, for having denied the Deity of Christ, which was the Foundation of Religious Worship, all his Arguments fell to the ground; *Socinus* impatient of this Baffle, and fearing it would be the utter overthrow of his Party, draws up some Opinions of *Franciscus David*, which were indeed as Gross and Heretical, as any that had been thought of, but such as were built on Socinian Principles; one was this, *Jesus of Nazareth, that is called Christ, was a Man that spake not by the Spirit of Prophecy, but by a Holy Spirit; and though he was sent of God, yet we may not account that whatever he spake came from the Mouth of God.* Hence it follows, that both his and the words of his Apostles, are to be brought and tryed by the Rule of the Law of *Moses* and the Prophets; and if any thing in their Writings be found disagreeing from that Rule, it is to be rejected, or at least to be interpreted so, as to agree with that Rule (is not this the same as to equal a Natural Faith with the Evangelical). which is the Standard of Faith and Manners. These Opinions, with an Antithesis to them, *Socinus* presents to *Bartholomaeus Prince of Transilvania*, who had cast *David* into Prison, on the Persecution of *Socinus* and *Blandrata*, (who would put it off on the *Samoatenians* and other Sects, who thereupon accused one another of Craft, Treachery, and Cruelty) and being imprisoned in *June*, died in *November* following. During his Imprisonment he fell into great distraction through anguish of Spirit (through the just Judgment of God upon him, saith *Socinus*) and in his distraction cried out, *Behold, who do expect me to be their Companion in my Journey; and in this dreadful condition he expired.* But his abominable Heresies died not with him, for one *Martyns Seidelius* was over-run with this Leprosie, who gives this account of his Opinions: *That the Doctrine of the Messias did not belong to him, for he was promised only to the Jews, as the promise of the good things of Canaan had been; so neither Circumcision and the Sacrifices and Ceremonies appointed by Moses do concern me, but the Jews only on whom they were imposed; neither were they the Worship of God, but an Introduction therunto. The true Worship of God, which I call my Religion, is the Decalogue which is the Eternal and Immutable Will of God, which I call mine, because it is given me by God, not by a Voice from Heaven, but ingrafted in my mind from the Creation; and because this Ingraven Decalogue is much obscured by the Corruption of Humane Nature and*  
wicked

wicked Customs, I add a Vocal Decalogue to illustrate it, which Vocal Decalogue doth therefore belong to me and to all Men, because it agrees with the Ingraven Decalogue, and is the same with it. This is my Opinion concerning the Messias, or the King promised; and this is the Religion which I ingenuously profess to you. Martyne Seidelius. This is another Professor of Natural Religion.

Servetus was a Spaniard of Tarracón, where he profess'd Physick, and joyning the Study of Divinity, he fell into the Error of the Antitrinitarians; his Blasphemous Writings and Discourses whereby he laboured to seduce others, caus'd him to leave his Country, from whence he, after he had wandred up and down, came and settled at Geneva, and there published his Blasphemous Heresies: *Beza* says, That he call'd the Trinity the Three Headed Cerberus, *Epist.* 1. And in the seven Books which he wrote concerning the Errors of the Trinity, speaking of the Eternal Generation of the Son, l. 1. he says, That then the Father ought to have a Spiritual Wife, or was an Harprophrodite, both Father and Mother; for the reason of the word permits not that any should be call'd a Father without a Mother. His other Errors were, That the Substance of God was mutable, and was a part of the Universe. He denied the Deity of the Son and the Holy Ghost; he affirm'd the Mortality of the Soul; and that Moses was a ridiculous Impostor, and the Church of Israel a Heard of Swine. He mention'd, saith Calvin, the Trinity to be a Devilish Phantasm, and Satanical Illusion, above and hundred times.

For these reasons he was imprison'd by the Magistrates of Geneva; and that they might proceed judiciously against him, they consult'd with the Helvetic Churches, who all approv'd of their intended Proceedings, and sentenc'd him to be Burnt, which Sentence was accordingly executed on him in Geneva, 1553. *Bulling.* Melach. and other great Divines approving of it, while he was in Prison many Divines, besides Calvin & Farel, perswaded him to Recant his Errors, which he obstinately refus'd; and after Sentence was past, he grew more sullen, refusing Converse, and to joyn in Prayers with others: And when he was to be executed, call'd on the People in the Spanish mode, *Miserere*; but not at all on God or our Saviour Christ; yet this Man as wicked as he was, is account'd a Martyr. Both living and dead was in great repute and esteem among the Socinians: *Theophilus Nicolai* calls him his Brother and Servant of the Messiah; What did not Michael Servetus, that learned Man and stout Defender of the Faith, suffer unjustly? *Ostorodus* made an Apology for him; so did *Voidovius*. And Socinus himself says, That he thought much more highly of Christ, than the Mahometans did, and in some things wrote against them. And when he was brought

brought to the Fire, he would not acknowledge the Eternal Son of God, but the Son of the Eternal God; for which they esteemed him a Martyr.

This sort of Serpents have had their lurking Holes in this Nation, and have attempted to poison the People, but hitherto have been prevented as soon as they began to peep abroad; I know not what they might have done, had they found a Man of such Learning and Confidence as our Author. In the Reign of Queen Mary, to the great Grief and Scandal of the Protestant Martyrs, there were some that suffered for denying the Godhead of Christ: in the Year 1579, one *Hamani* was burnt in *Norwich* for denying the Deity of Christ: and in the Year 1588, one *Kett* suffered for the same Blasphemy: In King *James* the First his Reign, one *Legate* suffered for the same Heresie. *Sandius* observes, p. 430. that Queen *Elizabeth* complained with grief, *That such Monsters as the Arians were found in her Kingdom*; whereof he gives an account, that some were executed in the Reigns of Queen *Elizabeth* and *James* the First.

In the Year 1579, there was printed at *London* an *Arian* Book, as *Sandius*, p. 430. called, *The Articles of the Family of Love*; and how deservedly that Family was subverted for their debauched and extravagant Practices, is sufficiently known.

In the late Troubles, when all Sects and Heresies were permitted, this Gangreen began to spread; their attempts were on the weaker sort of People, *Anabaptists* and *Quakers*, many of whom were seduced by some such Leaders as *Mr. Beedle* and *Pen*: And how far the Infection spread, the Reader may see in *Pagitt's Hiresiology*, and in *Edwards Gangrena*; where there is so much Filth, as makes me forbear to rake it up.

The *Socinians* have often boasted, that they could vie Authorities from the Fathers of the First three hundred Years, who have said more (as they falsely boast) against the Trinity and the Eternal Essence and Consubstantiality of the Son, than those which have asserted it; but as yet they have not attempted it; and *Mr. Bull's* Collection hath wholly discouraged that Attempt: it is true, that some of those Ancients spake warily of those and other Mysteries, and forbore to speak their own sense, or discover the nature of them; as it is evident they did industriously conceal the manner of administering the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, from not only the *Jews* and *Heathens*, but the *Catechumens* also; when therefore the publick Prayers were ended, the Deacon pronounced a Departure to such as were not the *Fideles*, who were not admitted to the Participation of the Eucharist, which practice is generally observed in the Churches of Christ.

*See Missa  
est.*

to this day. This was called *Disciplina Arcani*, and it was exercised in restraining all but the *Fideles* from Participation of the Eucharist, and the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity also, as some suppose. This Practice was grounded on the Words of our Saviour, (who also would not reveal his Deity to all sorts of Persons, nor some of the Mysteries of the Gospel, which he proposed in dark Parables, only for a certain time, the People being not able to bear them) the words are *Matth. 7. 6. Give not that which is holy to dogs, and cast not your pearls before swine*; which many of the Ancients understood of not exposing the more sacred Mysteries of the Gospel to such as had not received the more common Doctrines, and were not admitted to the number of the Faithful: to this purpose are quoted *Tertullian, Origene, Cyprian, Athanasius, Gregory Nyssene, and Nazianzen, Basil, Hierom, Epiphanius, both the Cirils, Chrysostome, Ambrose, and Augustine.*

I confess the Church of Rome would make advantage of this Discipline, but learned Men have bard them: I only observe, that such a Practice was ancient, and in some times reasonable.

*Antonius Pagi*, a Franciscan, in his *Critical Notes upon Baronius ad Seculum secundum*, p. 21, &c. gives us several Quotations to this purpose.

*St. Augustine* on *John*, Tract. 96. says, *That the Sacraments of the Faithful are not exposed to the Catechumens; and the Catechumens do not know what the Faithful do receive.*

*Chrysostom* on *Matth. Hom. 27. Those only that are initiated do know what the Faithful receive.*

*Origene* in his first Book against *Celsus*, shews the Reason as well as the Custom of concealing some Christian Rites; he tells him, *That the Doctrine of Christs Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and coming to Judgment, were known to all; but the Jews derided them; and that was the cause that other Mysteries were concealed, particularly that of the Holy Trinity.*

And concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, *St. Chrysostome Hom. 4. on 1 Cor.* professeth that he durst not speak of the Form of Baptism, and of the Creed, in which the Mystery of the Holy Trinity is explained, *I dare not* (saith he) *because of those that are not yet initiated, who make the Exposition more difficult, who compel us either not to speak openly, or to discover Secrets to them; yet I will speak of them as far as I am permitted, under Figures.*

*St. Cyril of Jer. Catech. 6.* speaking of the Mysteries contained in the Creed, says, *The Church layeth open these Mysteries and Sacraments to those that are initiated, but it is not their Custom to expose them to the Gentiles; we do not declare to them the Mystery of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; nor do we openly preach them to the Catechumens, but in such a se-*



cret manner, as they that profess the things may understand it, and they who understand it not, may not be prejudiced.

There is something to this purpose in Sox. l. 1. c. 20. *I thought (saith he) to have set forth a Copy of the Creed, as necessary for the Demonstration of our Faith, but when some of my Friends, pious Men, and well skilled in the knowledge of these things, perswaded me that I should keep in silence such things as are fit for Priests only to speak of, and for such as are already initiated to hear; I approved of their Counsel, because it is very probable that some who are not yet initiated, may read these Books; wherefore I have bid, as much as I could, those Secrets which ought to be concealed, acquainting the Reader with such Decrees of the Council, which they ought not to be wholly ignorant of.* And indeed we find that the Heathen, when they heard of the secret Doctrines of the Trinity, Sacraments, and Prayers of the Primitive Christians, did make sport of them, and ridicul'd them on their Theatres, and publick Plays; whereof we have an instance in *Lucian's Philopatra*, or a Dialogue, wherein he represents a Christian instructing an *Ethnick*, by whom he ought to swear, *Thou shalt swear, says he, by the God that rules on high, the great immortal and immutable God, by the Son of the Father, and by the Spirit proceeding from the Father, one in three, and three in one; conceive this to be Jupiter your God.* To which the *Ethnick* answers, *I cannot apprehend what you say is one three, and three one.* Thus also he scoffs at our Lord's Prayer, when the Heathen bids his Catechumen go and say the Prayer, beginning *Father*, and end with a Song of many Names; (*i.e.*) the *Doxology*. *Socinus* says in his Defence against *Eutropius*, *That he never read any thing more strong for the Opinion of the Trinity, than this of Lucian, he wrote in the time of Trajan.*

*St. Hierom*, speaking of the Translation of the *Septuagint*, says, *That the Translators did not reveal to Ptolomy the Incarnation of the Son of God, lest the Heathen should think they had two Gods.*

*Proeme on Gen. Casaubone on Baronius, Exerat. 16.* and *Monfieur Morney* mention the same Discipline; which may be a great reason why so few of those ancient Fathers mentioned the Trinity, and those who did, spake in such dark Terms, as our Author himself hath observed, p. 56. c. 2. that the Fathers of the Primitive Church did hide from the Catechumens the Rites of Sacraments. So that considering this Discipline which restrained many Ancients from publishing the whole Truth, and the diligence of the several Hereticks, to alker and expunge what was written against them, it is a wonderful Providence, that so many Authentick Testimones are preserved. The following Collections are mostly from *Mr. Bull's Book*, where the Reader may see them asserted.

The Epistle of *Barnabas*, written about the time of the Apostles, call Christ the Son of God, Lord of the whole World; by whom and for whom all things were made, (*i. e.*) by him as the Efficient, and for him as the Final Cause, which agreeth with the Apostle, *Rom. 11. 36.* and cannot be said of any but God without Blasphemy, *J. 1. c. 2. n. 2.* and in *c. 5.* of that Epistle, he says, *That he who foreknew all things, foretold his People that he would take away the Heart of Stone, and give them a Heart of Flesh, because he was to appear (or be made manifest) in the Flesh, and to dwell in us; for our Hearts, says he, are the holy Temple of the Lord.*

*Hermas*, another Apostolical Writer, in his Book called, *The Pastor*, affirms, *That the Son of God was present with his Father before all Creatures, and calls him his Counsellor, and that the name of the Son of God is great and infinite, that the whole World is sustained by him; and thus distinguishes between the Son of God and the Creatures, Similitud. 9. And 13. Simil. 5.* he says, *The Son of God is not put in a servile condition, but in great power; for to be put in the form of a Servant, and to be a Creature, are of one signification.* This agrees with that distinction of the Apostle, *Phil. 2. c. 6.* between the Form of a Servant and the Form of God. Of this Author *Petavius* says, *That he was never suspected to have any false Opinion of the Trinity.*

*Martialis*, a Bishop and Martyr, and who is said to have been one of the seventy Disciples, in his Epistle to the *Burdegaleses*, *c. 2.* says of our Saviour, *That as a Man born of the Virgin he could die; but as the Son of God, he was from the beginning, and as God he could not be held under the power of Death.* And Chap. 4. *He being the true God, and true Man, shall judge all Nations.* Chap. 10. *That the Spirit of God most glorious by Divine Equality, did proceed from the Word, not begotten, not made nor created, but the Word was begotten; therefore (says he) do ye not conceive any thing different in the Deity of the Trinity, because to you there is one and the same God, the Father that created all things, and one and the same Lord by whom all things were made, his Son Jesus Christ, and one and the same God the Holy Spirit, in whom all things subsist; and this Deity spoken of in three Persons, is one individed God.* And Chap. 11. *When we are freed from this Body, we shall be in Heaven with Christ, God and Man, whom we worshipped here on Earth.*

*Polycarp*, an Apostolical Author, in his undoubted Epistle to the *Philippians*, says, *Thou God, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal High Priest and Son of God, Build you up in the Faith and Truth, &c.* Such an Invocation is proper only to God with whom the Son is joyned. And again, *We are all in the sight of God and the Lord, and must all stand before the Tribunal of Christ.* And in another Fragment of *Poly-*

Polycarp; mentioned by Eusebius, l. 4. c. 15. we have these words, I bless thee in all things, and glorifie thee by the Eternal High-Priest Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, by whom to thee together with him in the Holy Spirit be glory, now and for ever.

Ignatius Bishop of Antioch, and a Martyr, was the Disciple of Polycarp, he begins his Epistle to the Smyrnians thus, I glorifie Jesus Christ God who hath made you so wise. And thus he salutes the Ephesians, by the good will of the Father and Jesus Christ our God; there is one Omnipotent God who manifested himself by Jesus Christ his Son, who is his substantial Word, and not by pronounciation, but the begotten Essence of the Divine Power. Ad Magnesium. So in the 5th to the Philis. The Lord commanded his Apostles to baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, not in one that had three names only, nor in three that were Incarnate; but in three of the same Dignity; for one of them was made Man, neither the Father nor the Holy Ghost, but the Son only, who was so not in opinion nor in Phantasie, but indeed, for the World was made Flesh, and dwelt among us. How should not he be God, who raised the Dead, made the lame to walk, cleansed the Leapers, and gave sight to the Blind.

And to the Philadelphians, There is one God the Father unhegotten, one Son the only begotten, God the Word and Man, one Paraclete the Spirit of Truth. If any one say there is one God, and confess Jesus Christ, but conceives him to be a meer Man, and not the only Begotten, the Word and Wisdom of God, but thinks him to consist only of a Body and a Soul, this Man is a Serpent; as Ebion was who taught error and deceit, Epist. 6.

To those of Smyrna, Epist. 7. he calls Christ the God that bore flesh. And Epist. 8. to Polycarp, He that was not possible as God, suffered for us as he was Man. In the 9th to the Antiochians, He who acknowledged me only God, to deny the Deity of Christ, he is a Devil, and Enemy of all Righteousness. And in the Conclusion of that Epistle, He who only is unbegotten, preserve you both in Body and Soul, by him who was born before Ages. Epistle 11. ad Ephes. The Word was made Flesh, the Incorporeal in a Body, the Impossible in a Body possible. In his Epistle to the Romans, Suffer me to be an Imitator of the Passion of Christ my God. And in another Epistle to the Ephes. There is one Physitian, Carnal and Spiritual, made and not made, God in the Flesh, the true Life in Death, of God and of Mary.

Clement Romanus useth the same distinction of our Saviour, according to the Flesh, and attributing to him the Splendor of the Magnificence of God, preferring him above the Angels: And his Expressions do so agree with those in Heb. 1, that Junius, after St. Hierom and others, have supposed him to be the Author of that Epistle; he exhorts the Corinthians to Humility, because, saith he, Our Lord Jesus Christ

*Christ, the Scepter of the Magnificence of God, came not in Pride.* Consider, says he, *what an Example is set before us; if the Lord so humbled himself, what should we do who live under the yoke of his grace.* There is a second Epistle of St. Clement mentioned by Eusebius, l. 3. c. 38. And in the Apostolical Canons, which speaks thus: *Brethren, we ought so to think of Jesus Christ as of God, nor ought we to think meanly of our Salvation, for if we think too meanly of him, we can hope but of little things from him.*

St. Justin Martyr, who being a Philosopher, became a Christian, in his Dialogue with Tryphon the Jew, calleth Christ King and God; he wrote an Exposition of the Faith, and of the Trinity in the same Essence, *There is one God of all, (saith he) who is known in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, for since the Father begot the Son of his own Nature and Essence, and produced the Holy Spirit from the same, therefore those which are of one and the same Essence, are rightly esteemed to be of one and the same Dignity.* And he calls Christ God before all Ages. And in his Apology to the Senate, he saith, *That Son of God who alone is properly called his Son, is the Word that was with him before the World was made, as the Light is with the Sun.*

Irenæus in his third Book against the Heresie of Valentian, &c. c. 6. saith, *Neither the Lord nor the Holy Spirit would have absolutely named him God who was not God, unless he had been the true God: Thus the Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy enemies thy foot-stool: For the Father speaks it to the Son, to whom he had given the Heathen for his Inheritance, and put all things under his feet: thus also it is said, Thy throne O God is for ever, &c. Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee; where both he that anointeth, and he that is anointed, are both called God by the Holy Spirit; and speaking of the Personal Union, c. 20. he says, The merciful God in his love to Mankind, did unite God and Man together, and that is believed the Mediator of God and Man to partake of the Nature of both.* This Author blames those that deny the Father of the Universe to have a Son, who being the Word, is the first Begotten, and so is God; and again in his Dialogue with Tryphon the Jew, he reproves them who deny Christ to be God, being the Son of the Ineffable and Singular God, and therefore calls him the Lord and God, as being the Son of God. And p. 33. he calls him, *The only Begotten of the Father of the Universe, the Word and Power properly begotten by him, and afterward made Man by the Virgin.* And he tells Tryphon, *That the Son was begotten of his Father, not by way of Abscession, as if the Substance of the Father was divided, but as one Fire is kindled by another, without any diminution of the first, which remains the same still; viz. the Fire kindling, and that which is kindled*

are of the same nature still. Among many other, I shall mention only that place of this Author in his second Apology, where he says, *The Christians are not Worshipers of many impure Gods, but they worship the Father, Son and Holy Ghost in reason and in truth.*

*Athenagoras*, a Philosopher and Christian, in his Apology for the Christians, to *Antoninus*, saith, *Least any should think me ridiculous in saying, that God hath a Son, (as the Poets who speak of Gods which were no other than Men) the Word or Reason of God is of the same Form and Efficacie with the Father, for of him and by him all things were made, and the Father and the Son are one, the Father being in the Son, and the Son in the Father; for the Word of the Father is the Son of God, united together in Power, Veriue and Substance, but distinguished in Subsistence and Personality.*

*Tatianus*, a Disciple of *Iustin Martyr*, in his Oration against the Greeks, says, *That Christ was begotten not by any abscission but by participation or communication; because that which is cut off is separated from the Original, but that which is communicated doth not diminish that which doth communicate, as the light of one Torch is not diminished by communicating light to another; so the Word going forth from the Power of the Father, did not leave the Father destitute of the Word.*

*Clement*, Bishop of *Alexandria*, the Disciple of *Pantenus*, a Martyr, and Master of *Origen*, saith, *That the Word was and is the Divine Principle of all things, which Word hath now appeared unto Men, who alone is both God and Man.* In his Admonition to the Gentiles, speaking on *Titus* 2. 13. of the Great God, he applies it to Christ, who saith, *He teacheth us to live well, that he may as God bestow eternal Life on us hereafter.* And then he persuades the Gentiles, *Believe, O Man, in him that was God and Man; believe him that suffered and is worshipped, the living God; believe in him all ye Men who alone is the God of all Men.* And there he tells them, *That he is most manifestly the true God, equal with the God of the Universe; the Son in the Father, and the Father in the Son:* And in his *Pedagog.* l. 1. calls him, *The Holy God Jesus.*

*Tertullian*, in his Apology against the Gentiles, c. 21. speaking of Christ saith, *We affirm him to be begotten of God, and therefore to be the Son of God by unity of Substance, for both are one Spirit; as when a Beam is extended from the Sun, the Sun is in the Beam, because it is a Beam of the Sun, the substance being not separated but extended; thus he is God of God; as is Light of Light, for whatsoever thus proceeds from God is God.* *Prolatum a patre non separatim dispositione alium non divisione,* (as *Grotius* on *John* 1. quotes him)

In his Book against *Praxeas*, he saith, *That God alone was before all things, but he was alone, because there was nothing without him, yet was*



be not alone, because he had his Joy, Reason with him. And Grotius on John 1. quotes Tatianus speaking to the same sense, That Christ was *αἰσθητός καὶ λόγος ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. So Tertullian calls him, God of God, and Light of Light, the Son not separate from the Father, of one undivided Substance; he cont. a Proximum, i. e. 4. *uteneo unum substantium in tribus coherentibus*; That the visible Trinity is of one Dignity and Power: In c. 17. he ascribes all the Attributes of God the Father to the Son; and chap. 2. against Praxeas, he says, *The name of the Father is the Almighty God, the most High, the God of Israel*; all these agree to the Son, and on Christ's words, *I and my Father are one*; he shews that they are two, whom he makes equal, and joyns in one.

Theophilus: Antiochensis, writing to Autolocus, l. 2. says, *That which is begotten of God is God; Which he speaks of the Word, alway existing in the heart of God.*

Irenæus, l. 3. c. 6. says, That neither our Lord nor the Holy Spirit, nor  
 the Apostles, would so distinctly and absolutely have called Christ God, unless  
 he had been the true God; and if at any time he gives the name to spirits  
 that are not Gods, he is with some addition and signification to manifest that  
 they are not true Gods— And from Christ's words to the Pharisees con-  
 cerning the Resurrection, I am the God of Abraham, &c. he con-  
 cluded, That Christ with his Father is the God of the Living, who spoke to  
 Moses, and was manifested to the Father. And he applies that of the  
 Apostle to the Rom. 9. v. 5. Whose were the Fathers, and of whom was  
 Christ (according to the flesh) who is God over all, blessed for ever: which  
 Scripture is so expounded by most of the Fathers. He proves also the  
 Deity of Christ, he says, That Christ is the measure of the Father, be-  
 cause he comprehends him. And this he appropriates to our Saviour,  
 who only comprehends the Father, and he excludes the whole Crea-  
 tion from knowing or apprehending the Father according to his Great-  
 ness. L. 2. c. 43. he says, Thou, O Man, wert created, and didst not al-  
 way exist with God, as doth his own Word. And l. 3. c. 8. he says, No-  
 thing can be compared with the Word of God, by whom all things were  
 made.

*Causes*, an ancient Presbyter, of whom *Abbas* makes mention, in these words: *That he saught expressly of the Father of Christ our God, and of his Ineffable Generation by the Father.* 2 ed. 1662. ad. 1660. 1661. 1662. 1663. 1664. 1665. 1666. 1667. 1668. 1669. 1670. 1671. 1672. 1673. 1674. 1675. 1676. 1677. 1678. 1679. 1680. 1681. 1682. 1683. 1684. 1685. 1686. 1687. 1688. 1689. 1690. 1691. 1692. 1693. 1694. 1695. 1696. 1697. 1698. 1699. 1700. 1701. 1702. 1703. 1704. 1705. 1706. 1707. 1708. 1709. 1710. 1711. 1712. 1713. 1714. 1715. 1716. 1717. 1718. 1719. 1720. 1721. 1722. 1723. 1724. 1725. 1726. 1727. 1728. 1729. 1730. 1731. 1732. 1733. 1734. 1735. 1736. 1737. 1738. 1739. 1740. 1741. 1742. 1743. 1744. 1745. 1746. 1747. 1748. 1749. 1750. 1751. 1752. 1753. 1754. 1755. 1756. 1757. 1758. 1759. 1760. 1761. 1762. 1763. 1764. 1765. 1766. 1767. 1768. 1769. 1770. 1771. 1772. 1773. 1774. 1775. 1776. 1777. 1778. 1779. 1780. 1781. 1782. 1783. 1784. 1785. 1786. 1787. 1788. 1789. 1790. 1791. 1792. 1793. 1794. 1795. 1796. 1797. 1798. 1799. 1800. 1801. 1802. 1803. 1804. 1805. 1806. 1807. 1808. 1809. 1810. 1811. 1812. 1813. 1814. 1815. 1816. 1817. 1818. 1819. 1820. 1821. 1822. 1823. 1824. 1825. 1826. 1827. 1828. 1829. 1830. 1831. 1832. 1833. 1834. 1835. 1836. 1837. 1838. 1839. 1840. 1841. 1842. 1843. 1844. 1845. 1846. 1847. 1848. 1849. 1850. 1851. 1852. 1853. 1854. 1855. 1856. 1857. 1858. 1859. 1860. 1861. 1862. 1863. 1864. 1865. 1866. 1867. 1868. 1869. 1870. 1871. 1872. 1873. 1874. 1875. 1876. 1877. 1878. 1879. 1880. 1881. 1882. 1883. 1884. 1885. 1886. 1887. 1888. 1889. 1890. 1891. 1892. 1893. 1894. 1895. 1896. 1897. 1898. 1899. 1900. 1901. 1902. 1903. 1904. 1905. 1906. 1907. 1908. 1909. 1910. 1911. 1912. 1913. 1914. 1915. 1916. 1917. 1918. 1919. 1920. 1921. 1922. 1923. 1924. 1925. 1926. 1927. 1928. 1929. 1930. 1931. 1932. 1933. 1934. 1935. 1936. 1937. 1938. 1939. 1940. 1941. 1942. 1943. 1944. 1945. 1946. 1947. 1948. 1949. 1950. 1951. 1952. 1953. 1954. 1955. 1956. 1957. 1958. 1959. 1960. 1961. 1962. 1963. 1964. 1965. 1966. 1967. 1968. 1969. 1970. 1971. 1972. 1973. 1974. 1975. 1976. 1977. 1978. 1979. 1980. 1981. 1982. 1983. 1984. 1985. 1986. 1987. 1988. 1989. 1990. 1991. 1992. 1993. 1994. 1995. 1996. 1997. 1998. 1999. 2000. 2001. 2002. 2003. 2004. 2005. 2006. 2007. 2008. 2009. 2010. 2011. 2012. 2013. 2014. 2015. 2016. 2017. 2018. 2019. 2020. 2021. 2022. 2023. 2024. 2025. 2026. 2027. 2028. 2029. 2030. 2031. 2032. 2033. 2034. 2035. 2036. 2037. 2038. 2039. 2040. 2041. 2042. 2043. 2044. 2045. 2046. 2047. 2048. 2049. 2050. 2051. 2052. 2053. 2054. 2055. 2056. 2057. 2058. 2059. 2060. 2061. 2062. 2063. 2064. 2065. 2066. 2067. 2068. 2069. 2070. 2071. 2072. 2073. 2074. 2075. 2076. 2077. 2078. 2079. 2080. 2081. 2082. 2083. 2084. 2085. 2086. 2087. 2088. 2089. 2090. 2091. 2092. 2093. 2094. 2095. 2096. 2097. 2098. 2099. 2100. 2101. 2102. 2103. 2104. 2105. 2106. 2107. 2108. 2109. 2110. 2111. 2112. 2113. 2114. 2115. 2116. 2117. 2118. 2119. 2120. 2121. 2122. 2123. 2124. 2125. 2126. 2127. 2128. 2129. 2130. 2131. 2132. 2133. 2134. 2135. 2136. 2137. 2138. 2139. 2140. 2141. 2142. 2143. 2144. 2145. 2146. 2147. 2148. 2149. 2150. 2151. 2152. 2153. 2154. 2155. 2156. 2157. 2158. 2159. 2160. 2161. 2162. 2163. 2164. 2165. 2166. 2167. 2168. 2169. 2170. 2171. 2172. 2173. 2174. 2175. 2176. 2177. 2178. 2179. 2180. 2181. 2182. 2183. 2184. 2185. 2186. 2187. 2188. 2189. 2190. 2191. 2192. 2193. 2194. 2195. 2196. 2197. 2198. 2199. 2200. 2201. 2202. 2203. 2204. 2205. 2206. 2207. 2208. 2209. 2210. 2211. 2212. 2213. 2214. 2215. 2216. 2217. 2218. 2219. 2220. 2221. 2222. 2223. 2224. 2225. 2226. 2227. 2228. 2229. 2230. 2231. 2232. 2233. 2234. 2235. 2236. 2237. 2238. 2239. 2240. 2241. 2242. 2243. 2244. 2245. 2246. 2247. 2248. 2249. 2250. 2251. 2252. 2253. 2254. 2255. 2256. 2257. 2258. 2259. 2260. 2261. 2262. 2263. 2264. 2265. 2266. 2267. 2268. 2269. 2270. 2271. 2272. 2273. 2274. 2275. 2276. 2277. 2278. 2279. 2280. 2281. 2282. 2283. 2284. 2285. 2286. 2287. 2288. 2289. 2290. 2291. 2292. 2293. 2294. 2295. 2296. 2297. 2298. 2299. 2300. 2301. 2302. 2303. 2304. 2305. 2306. 2307. 2308. 2309. 2310. 2311. 2312. 2313. 2314. 2315. 2316. 2317. 2318. 2319. 2320. 2321. 2322. 2323. 2324. 2325. 2326. 2327. 2328. 2329. 233

*Hypollitus, a Marrys, about the Year 280, (speaking of Christ, says, He was the infinite God, and also a Man, that had perfectly the perfect substance of both; and that his Divinity was the same after his Incarnation as before, infinite, incomprehensible, impassible, unchangeable, and in brief, a substantial subsistence.*

Origen,

*Origen*, whose most mature and perfect Work being that of his Dispute with *Celsus*, written when he was about sixty Years old, confirms the same Doctrine; speaking of the wise Men that presented their Gifts to our Saviour, says, *That they offered them to him that was God and Man; Gold as to a King, Mirrh as to a Mortal Man, and Frankinsence as to GOD.* And that Christ had something that was Divine under the Humane Nature, which was properly the Son of God, God the Word, the Power and Wisdom of God; *We do not separate,* says he, *the Son of God from Jesus, for both the Soul and Body of Jesus were strictly united with the Word of God;* and of the Body of Christ he says, *It was the Temple of God the Word.*

*St. Cyprian*, another *Latine* Father, a Bishop of *Africa*, and an eminent Martyr, writing to *Quirinus* against the *Jews*, mentioneth divers Scriptures to prove Christ to be God, as *Isa. 45. Psal. 46.* and proves, *That Christ being God and Man, became Mediator between us and his Father.*

In his Epistle to *Cecilian*, speaking of Christ, saith, *He is the Power, Reason, and Wisdom of God, he descended into the Virgin, and was God mixt with Man, he is our God our Christ.*

And to name no more, c. 11. speaking of the Divine and Humane Nature of Christ, he says, *That as Nature teacheth, that he that is born of Man is Man, so it teacheth that he that is born of God is God.*

*Theognostus* of *Alexandria*, as *Athanasius* quotes him, taught the same Doctrine, *That the Son was begotten of the Substance of the Father, as as Beams from the Sun, and as the Sun is not lessened by the effusion of its Beams, so neither is the Substance of the Father diminished by begetting the Son, the Image of himself.*

*Dionysius Romanus* wrote an Epistle against the *Sabellians*, wherein he says, *It is necessary that the Word of God be united to the God of all, and that the holy Spirit remains in God, and so the holy Trinity doth unite in One as in a certain Head, viz. the Omnipotent God of the Universe.* And he confutes those who hold the Son of God to be made as other Creatures, as being contrary to the Scripture.

*Lastly*, That the Trinity is not to be divided into three Gods, nor the Dignity of it to be lessened by the name of a Creature, but we are to believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his Son, and in the Holy Spirit. And that the Son is united to the Father, he proves from the words of our Saviour, *I and the Father are one;* for thus the Divine Trinity, and the preaching of that Holy Monarchy is preserved.

*Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, whom the *Arians* boasted to be of their Party, wrote against them in his own defence an Epistle, which he calls

a Refutation, wherein he declares, That he never was of the Opinion of Arius; but that he alway thought our Lord to be the Word and Wisdom undivided from the Father: For (saith he) under the name of the Father, I imply that he hath a Son; and when I mention the Son, I understand also that he hath a Father; and so I joyn them together, for from whom should the Son come, but from the Father? But the Arians will not understand that the Son cannot be separated from the Father, the names implying a communion between them; and the Holy Ghost is in both, and cannot be separated from him that sends him. How then can you suspect me who use those Names, to have thought that they may be divided or separated; wherefore you accuse me falsely, as if I had denied that Christ is Consubstantial with God: Thus I said that the Plant proceeds from the Seed or Root, and is another thing from that from whence it proceeds, yet is it of the same nature with that whence it proceeds: the River which flows from the Fountain hath another name, for we do not call the River the Fountain, nor the Fountain the River, yet both do exist, and the Fountain is as a Father, but the River is Water flowing from the Fountain.

Greg. Thaumaturgus Bishop of Neocæsaria, hath left us this Confession of his Faith, recorded by Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. l. 7. c. 28. There is one God, the Father of the Living Word, the Subsisting Wisdom, the Eternal Power and Character; the perfect Father of him that is perfect, the Father of the only Begotten: There is one Lord alone from him that is alone God of God, the Character and Image of the Deity, the efficacious Word, the Wisdom comprehending the constitution of all things, and the effective Power of all things; the true Son of the true Father, invisible of him that is invisible, incorruptible from him that is incorruptible, immortal and eternal: And there is one Holy Spirit that hath its existence of God, who by the Son hath appeared unto Men, the perfect Image of the perfect Son, the Life and Cause of the Living, the Holy Fountain, Sanctity, and Grover of Sanctification; in whom God the Father is manifest, who is above all and in all, and God the Son which is in all.

The perfect Trinity which is not divided nor separated in Glory, Eternity, Kingdom, and Power; so that there is nothing in the Trinity that is created or servile, nothing added, or superinducted, which was not before: The Son was never wanting to the Father, nor the Spirit to the Son, but the Trinity alway remained the same, immutable and invariable.

In the Life-time of this Greg. Thaumaturgus, a Synod of Bishops met at Antioch, to Censure the Heresie of Paulus Samosatenus, who denied the Deity of Christ. These Bishops denounced an Anathema against him, having first admonished him of his Heresie; and in that Epistle they say, That they declare the Faith which they received from the beginning,

ning, and always held in the Catholic Church from the Apostles to that day, even from those that had seen with their eyes, and were made Ministers of the Word, and which was preached in the Law and Prophets, and in the New Testament. And the Faith concerning Christ they say is this: That he is the Word the Wisdom and Power of God, that was before all Ages, God the Son of God in substance and subsistence.

Pierius, a Presbyter of Alexandria, was of the same Opinion; as Photinus relates Cod. 119. That the Father and the Son were of one Substance and Equality.

St. Lucian, a Presbyter of Antioch, published the same Faith, which is to be seen in Socrates, l. 2. c. 10. We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things, and in one Lord Jesus Christ his only begotten Son, by whom all things were made, begotten of the Father before all Ages, God of God, Whole of Whole, Sole of Sole, Perfect of Perfect, King of King, Lord of Lord, the Living Word, Wisdom, Life, the true Light, Way, and Truth, the Resurrection, Pastor, and Gate, not obnoxious to Change or Alteration, every way the express Image of the Father's Deity, Substance, Power, Counsel, and Glory, the first Begotten of every Creature, who was with God in the beginning, God the Word as is said in the Scripture, who in the last times came down from Heaven, and was born of a Virgin, according to the Scripture: and in the Holy Ghost which is given to Believers to comfort, sanctify and consummate them, as our Lord Christ commended his Disciples, go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who are three in Person, but agree in One.

Arnobius gives the like Testimony, That Christ without any Instrument, Help or Rule, but by the power of his own Nature made all things, and as it was worthy of God, nothing that was hurtful, but all beneficial, and this is the property of the true God to deny his bounty to none.

Lastly, Lactantius, whom the Arians claim to be of their Opinion, says thus: When we say God the Father, and God the Son, we do not speak of what is diverse or separated, because neither the Father can be so called without the Son, nor the Son be begotten without the Father, seeing therefore the Father makes the Son, and the Son makes him a Father, there is in both one Mind, one Spirit, and one Substance; the one as a Fountain, the other as a Stream flowing from him, or as the Beams from the Sun, which are not separated.

These many and plain Evidences of the Belief of the Antient Fathers, before the Council of Nice, do evidently declare, what sure footing they had for their Faith, (viz.) the unanimous Consent of Apostolical Men, Martyrs, and Confessors, who maintained that the Son of God was of the same Divine Nature and Substance with his Father, consonant to the Doctrine of the Holy Scripture; and con-

sequently they also shew how rashly and inconsiderately the Doctor says, p. 37. c. 1. *That we have no firm ground to go upon, that this Doctrine was first advanced by a Novice Emperor, upon implicate Faith in two Bishops.* P. 38. c. 2. *That it hath no foundation in Scripture, Antiquity, or Councils; and that the Athanasian may be numbered among the Popish and Arian Doctrines, which we know to be contradictory in the case of the Trinity.* And if in the mouth of two or three Witnesses, every truth should be established, how much more should this Truth be received as unquestionable, being confirmed by the Harmony of the Old and New Testament, by the Notions of the Apostolical Writers in the Primitive Times, and by their Successors home to the Nicene Council, who all delivered it not as their own Faith, but as the Faith of their Predecessors, home to the Apostles days: And as for Councils, the Synods that were before the Council of Nice, and all since, except a few under some Emperors, deluded by the Sophistry of the *Arians*, and circumvented by their Hypocrisie and Falshood, have been constantly of the same Judgment with that of Nice.

Concerning the Eternal Generation of Christ, there is a plain sense of the *Anti-Nicene* Fathers that will answer all the Objections made by the *Arians* against that Eternal Generation of Christ, and their Opinions that he was only the first begotten of the Creatures, being himself made in order to the making of the World; for they assert, *That the Word did always exist with his Father, but there was a prolation, emission or application of the Son, ad exteriora, the Father in order to the Creation; and this is by some metaphorically called a Generation, not as if he then had a beginning; for God, as Arbenagoras says, who is an Eternal Mind, had in himself his Eternal Word from Eternity, though the Energy or Operation of that Word appeared first in the Creation; in which sense he calls the Word the first begotten, But such* (says he) *is not made him by whom all things were made.* This one Distinction of the Word or Son of God being Co-eternal with the Father, and his Emission, *προελυσις* or Progression for the manifestation of his Father and himself, *ελωγεναν*, in the Creation of the World, if duly considered, as delivered by the Fathers before the Nicene Council, will confute all the Councils of the *Arians* and *Socinians*, against those parallel places of Scripture, and particularly against such as speak of the Primogeniture of our Saviour, as if he were a *Deus Factus*, or a Creature. Having shewed the Authority of Scripture and the Fathers to be against the *Arian* and *Socinian* Doctrines, there is no necessity of urging that of Councils, which they peremptorily decline: so *Sandius* in his Preface to the Reader, *Ask for the old Paths*, saith he, *not of Synods nor of Councils, nor the Books of* Creeds,



*Creds, which later Ages have set forth.* He was conscious that these would be generally against him, except a few that were managed by *Arian* Emperors; so that we have their consent to let these be silent for fear of their *Anathema's*.

It is observed that in all Lands, where any venomous Creatures are bred, there may be found some others that serve as an Antidote to that Venome, and sometimes in that very Creature where the Poyson is lodged there is a Medicine to expel it, as in the Viper; the same Divine Providence hath in all Ages so ordered it, that whatever Heresies have been conceived by erroneous Persons, have been stifled in their birth, by such as God hath raised up for the suppression of them: An instance whereof we have in this Heretical Treatise, which as it was brought to light by a Rector of *Exeter-Colledge*, so by another Rector of the same Colledge, it was provided long before to condemn it to perpetual Darkeness; and I may truly say it was *Damnata prius quam nata*; condemned to dye before it was born: And if the Antidote prepared by the One, be duly applied, the Dose of Poyson is not of so quick an operation, but by the Blessing of God, the ill effects of it may be prevented: I have therefore for the benefit of ignorant and wavering Persons, translated that Learned Lecture of the Reverend Dr. *Prideaux*, the King's Professor of Divinity in *Oxford*, and Rector of *Exeter Colledge*, in the Year 1633. which begins p. 276. of his Lectures in Folio; the Text which he chose to insist on is,

## Matth. xvi. v. 16.

*Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ the Son of the living GOD.*

**T**His celebrated Testimony concerning our Saviour, is recommended to us by these four Particulars:

- First*, That it was not Sudden but Deliberate.
- Secondly*, It was not Private, but spoken in the Name of all the Apostles.
- Thirdly*, That it was not casually uttered, but after a double Demand of Christ. To which add,
- Fourthly*, The Approbation of Christ, and the Reward of St. Peter that published this Testimony.

Now the Scripture is not wont to propose trivial things with so great solemnity; there is therefore something more in the matter than  
at

at first appears in the words of this Answer, from whence both the Ancient and Moderns with clear and often confirmed assent, have believed and asserted not only the Humanity of Christ, which he took of the Seed of *Abraham*, but also the Divinity of the Son of the Living God by ineffable Generation communicated to him by the Father from Eternity.

But that which *St. Peter* foretold, That false Teachers shall be among you, which will bring in damnable Heresies, denying the Lord that bought them; to which they were afore ordain'd, saith *St. Peter*; raised up saith *St. Paul*; fitted and prepared, that same, the nau-  
1 Pet. 2, 8.  
Rom. 9. 17.  
Rom. 9. 22.  
 scousness of these times have vomited into the bosom of the Church, Faction doth cherish, Industry defends, Sagacity promotes, Wit urg-  
 eth, Hypocrisie publisheth under the Veil of Sincerity; So that un-  
 less such as *Timothy* carefully take heed to themselves and their *deposi-  
 tum*; and such as *St. Jude* contend for the Faith once delivered, there  
 is great danger lest the Unclean Spirit that was cast forth by the Re-  
 formation, return to the House that is swept and cleansed with a  
 more numerous Train, and the last State of the Church become worse  
 than the former.

2 S. Now among those Seven unclean Spirits that create trouble to the Church swept and garnished, viz. 1. *Papists*. 2. *False Luth-  
 erans*. 3. *Anabaptists*. 4. *Disciplinarians*. 5. *Weigelians*. 6. *Remon-  
 strants*. 7. *Socinians*. The others being either sufficiently vanquish'd  
 or removed far from us, the *Socinians* in our time do more secretly  
 creep in, and more dangerously undermine; for these are not con-  
 tent wholly to obliterate Original Sin and the Satisfaction of our Sa-  
 viour, unless wishal they wholly abolish the Eternity of the Son of  
 the Living God, so that he may be no longer called, God-man, but  
 a Man of God, and not the Eternal Son of God, but the Son of the  
 Eternal God; as dying *Sermatus* did blaspheme.

It were to be wished that such Prodiges of Opinions had never  
 toucht our Shoars; and it had been better that in their passage hither  
 they had been sunk in the bottom of the Sea, with a Mill-stone about  
 their necks: But what must be done when they daily rise up to the  
 scandal of the Weak, and no small disgrace to Religion, in foreign  
 Parts; their wicked Attempts have been opposed by *Bellarmino*, *Scar-  
 ga*, *Weike* and *Smiglicius*, Jesuits; by *Francisco Siegmundus*, *Prokav*, *Meis-  
 ner*, *Martinius*, *Flaminius*, *Winkelmann*, *Gervius*, *Gerrardus*, *Brochmann*,  
*Himelius*, *Toralieus*, among the *Lutherans*; and by *Calvinists*, *Luber-  
 tus*, *Lucier*, *Gasmannus*, *Jacobus a Porta*, *Jo. Junius*, *Maccovius*, *Raven-  
 spergerus*, *Wendeline*, *Zarnovicius* and *Covet*, with many others; *Calvin*  
 against *Servetus Zanchius* in thirteen Books, *De Tribus Elodim*, dedica-  
 ted

ted to Archbishop *Grindal*, and the Earl of *Bedford*; *Zach. Ursine* against the *Cracovian Catechism*; *Franciscus Junius* against an *Anonimus Arian*, and others; these had diligently trodden down those Tares for a time, which now spring up again with pestilent increase, by the sowing of the wicked Enemy. Our Country-men I confess were slower in weeding out these Tares; whether it was as surprized at the return of those Blasphemies from Hell, or whether they thought it more adviseable to let them dye in silence, than curiously to examine them to feed Curiosity. But moderate Counsels cannot withstand importunate Attempts: their petulancy compels me to speak as *St. Hilary*; to undertake Difficulties, and as it were to speak things that ought to be kept secret; especially seeing our Adversaries triumph at our silence, boasting that they have over-come, where no opposition is made. Now there are three things wherein we place the main hopes of our Salvation:

- I. The Knowledge of our Misery by Original Corruption.
- II. The Knowledge of a Saviour by his redeeming Satisfaction.
- III. A grateful Return of faithful and due Obedience.

But those who deny Original Sin, and the Redemption of Christ, are not likely to be truly Grateful. Of Original Sin and the Satisfaction of Christ, I have already treated against these subtle Enemies, who neither acknowledge their Misery, nor grant the Necessity of any Satisfaction; I now stand up by the assistance of Christ, and your leave, for the Defence of the Deity of Christ; especially seeing not long since *Jo. Crellius*, by the united Strength and Arts of the whole Sect, hath so boldly assaulted the chief Foundation of our Salvation; therefore the Question to be now discuss'd is, Whether Christ be Eternal God Co-essential with the Father and Holy Spirit?

3 S. This Question that we may handle with due Reverence, and saving Advantage, do Thou, O Son of the Living God, illuminate me with the Rays of thy Eternal Deity, and grant me a Mouth and Wisdom, which they that Gain say, may not be able to resist. Being thus prepared, that I may not stop at the Threshold, it must be observed, That the Adversaries grant to the Father both Eternity and Personality, to the Son a Personality but not Eternity, but to the Holy Ghost an Eternity but not Personality. And in this they differ from the ancient *Arians*, that these acknowledge the Son of the Living God to be the first Born of the Creatures; but the *Socinians*, that he was born after his Mother: For which reason *Smiglerius* doth not well, imputing *Arianism* to them; while with more labour than suc-

cess

## An Answer to a late Treatise, Entituled,

cess he disputes against those New Monsters, as he calls them; for the *Socinians* attribute less to our Saviour than the *Arians*; both affirm him to be a Creature, but the *Arians* a more noble Creature, as is manifest by the Disputation held at *Cracow*, between *Faustus*, *Socinus*, and *Erasmus*, a Minister of *Transilvania*; and therefore they affect to be called the Reformers of *Arius*, rather than his Disciples, as it is in the Answers of *Moscorovius* and *Smalsius* against *Smiglesius*.

2. It is to be observed, That the Papists give no small advantage to the Cause which they oppose, while they tenaciously hold in their School-Divinity, that Christ merited for himself, and that he was our Mediator according to his Humane Nature only; for hence the Adversaries infer, that that which he performed was but due, and therefore it was to be to his own advantage only: Whence therefore is that superabundant Merit by which he satisfied the Father for us? And if his Humane Nature only were sufficient for the Work of our Redemption, what need was there of his being God and Man? I know what the Jesuits are wont to answer here; but in my opinion we ought not rashly to grant any thing to such Sophisters as wrest all things to their own ends with great Art.

3. This must not be omitted, that in Scripture he is called God, that is so by Nature or Donation, and by gift either in regard of Sanctification, or Mission, or Commission, or all these jointly.

4. Observe that a thing is counted Eternal as to Duration, Indetermination, Continuation and Signification; to Duration because it wants beginning or end, and so God alone is Eternal, or because it wants an end only, so Angels and Humane Souls, which are called for distinction sake, Eviternal; as to Indetermination, *Aaron's* Priesthood was called Eternal because no determinate end was appointed to it; as to Continuation, that is called Eternal that flows on without interruption; as to Signification, Circumcision is called Eternal, not as to itself but its Anti-type.

5. These words Essence, Existence, Subsistence, ought accurately to be distinguished one from the other; so that Essence may be fitly applied to the Nature, Subsistence to Persons, Existence to Notions; and for clearer distinction, Nature answers to the question what, Person to the question who, and Notion to the manner how: But we have no dependance on these Terms of the Fathers and Schools, but use them not as if our Faith needed them, but because the Perverseness of our Adversaries hath forced the Orthodox to express themselves after this manner, to defeat the Devices of those Men who seek to hide themselves in the dark Labyrinths of Humane Reason, whence we affirm that these ten words: Essence, Coessential, Subsistence,

sistence, Substance, Person, Propriety, Relation, Notion, Circumcision, Trinity, have been rightly (though unwillingly) devised by the Fathers, retained by the School-men, explicated by *Bellarmino*, *Zanchy*, &c. to serve in this business as Prospective to discover the Subtilties of the Adversaries, which otherwise might escape their sight, not in prejudice of the Text, but for the help of reasoning from the Text.

*First*, It is agreed that there is a Trinity, and in this Trinity there is a Priority of Origination acknowledged by all: So *Smalsius*, I deny not that there is Father, Son and Holy Ghost; and that this may be called a Trinity. So the *Nicene Fathers* say of the Son, that he is God of God, Light of Light, true God of true God, which expressions imply at least a Prerogative of Order, though not of Nature, in which respect *Eusebius Caesar* scarce deserves to be accused of *Arianism* by the Papists, for affirming the Co-eternity of the Son with the Father, against the *Arians*; only he is observed to hesitate at their Co-equality, where if he only mean the Co-equality of Order, not of Nature, he may pass for a good Catholic.

*Secondly*, It is agreed, that Christ is truly and properly called the Son of the Living God, seeing he took his Original not after Humane manner, from mortal Seed, but was conceived in the Virgin's Womb by the Holy Spirit overshadowing her, and the Power of the most High coming upon her; and is therefore called the Son of God; *Luke. 1. 35*.

*Thirdly*, It is agreed, that Christ is expressly called God, in respect of his Mission-office and Dominion, and therefore is exalted above all Creatures, to be adored with Divine Worship together with the Father, and to be invoked as the Searcher of Hearts; and Omnipotent as *Smalsius* confesseth in his Book of the Divinity of Christ; and *Socinus* in his Defence against *Christianus Franken*.

The Question then may be reduced to these Terms, Whether Christ the *Messiah*, the Redeemer and Saviour of us all, be God, not by Donation only from the Father, by Pre-eminence of Authority, or Dominion, but by Nature, not as to Indetermination, Continuation or Signification, ETERNAL but ETERNAL without beginning or end, not of an inferior or another, but of the same Essence with the Father and the Holy Ghost, not of a like but the same Nature, as the Ancients speak, and as our second Article expresseth it, Consubstantial; here the *Papists*, the *Lutherans*, the *Greek*, *Asian* and *African Churches* affirm as we do.

The *Transylvanians*, some *Polonians*, and some *Apostate Hollanders*, as appears by their Writings, which are in too many hands, do deny.



The principal Arguments for Confirmation of our part are these :

Here we shall not heap up all the Arguments, but choose such as time will permit to handle: 1. From the Text, *Thou art Christ the Son of the living God*, whence I argue, The Son is of the same Nature with the Father, so Man begets Man, &c. but Christ is the Son of God, the first begotten, not the first created; the only begotten, his proper Son, therefore he is of the same Essence with the Father; and consequently as is express in the first Article, of the same Power and Eternity. *Cressius* endeavours to avoid the edge of this Answer, by this sorry Evasion, That the Son of God signifies no more than the Anointed of God; so that he is called Son not by Nature but *Unction*; and therefore the addition of, *The living God*, is omitted in *St. Mark* and *Luke*.

*Ans.* This is to find fault with the Text, rather than the Inference from it; as if *St. Matthew* did intend to deceive; and not inform us, and were to be corrected by *St. Mark* and *St. Luke*, as *Cressius* would have it.

2. 'Tis no contradiction to say less than had been said by another; now in *St. John* we have the same Confession as here in *Matthew*.

3. By *Unction* Kings and Priests are made, but Sons by Generation; and therefore the Word Son expresseth his Person, as the word Christ his Office; Christ and the Son of God signifies the same Person, but not in the same respect.

*Socinus* objects, That the same manner of expression is *Isa. 1. 10.* where the *Israelites* are called the Sons of the Living God, not that they were Sons co-essential with God, but that they were Sons of the Living God as opposed to Idols; whence it appears this Epithet of God, (*vix*) Living, shews of what sort of God Christ is Son, not what sort of Son he is.

To which we answer, That by the Adversary's confession, this Epithet Living, declares what sort of God the Father is; therefore I infer that it shews also what sort of Son the Son is; as the Maxim is, *Qualis pater talis filius*, (*i. e.*) In living Beings, he that begets and he that is begotten is of the same sort.

2. In *Hosea* Sons of the Living God are opposed to such as were not the People of God, not as if they were natural Sons, but adopted, by calling not by being begotten, as it is express, *They shall be called*, &c. *Rom. 9. 26.* So that here is no relation to Idols, who neither beget nor are begotten.

3. The Text shews the Son of the Living God is opposed to the Son of a Mortal Man, as being of a more excellent kind, for all saw him to be the Son of Man; some said the *Baptist*, others that *Elias*

or

or *Jeremiah* were revived. But this inspired Confession of *St. Peter* signifies something more sublime; *Q. P.* we profess that thou art not merely the Son of mortal Man, as the *Baptist* and others of Humane Seed, but that thou art the Son of that Eternal God which alway liveth: As therefore he was of the same Nature with his Mother, as the Son of Man, so it is necessary that he be of the same Nature with the Father, as the Son of the Living God.

Here *Oporadus* objects, That begetting of a Son implys the Mortality of the Parent; for to what purpose are Sons begotten, but to continue the succession of those that are mortal?

*Ans.* This is very acute! as if there were no difference between natural and temporal Generations, and this which is eternal and ineffable: Sons are adopted to supply succession; and did the Ancient of days adopt the Son of Man for succession's sake? See to what our Rationalists reduce the matter. *Socinus* more distinctly explains the Mystery, *It is not to be denied that the Power of God did convey into, or create in the Virgin's womb some substance, out of which, conjoin'd with that which was of the Virgin's substance, Christ became true Man, who on that account had not only the Virgin for his Mother, but God also for his Father, considered as Man.*

*Ans.* Where doth the Scripture speak of this Socinian Mafs? Yes, say they, *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the most High overshadow thee.* True, but doth it follow hence, that he created any such Substance as they feign; this is Logick above our apprehension. The Text speaks of a Virtue and Power, not of any Substance; now a Son is product from the Substance of the Father, and in likeness of Nature, whence he is called Son of the Virgin, not of the Holy Ghost, who communicated a power of Conception to her: This imaginary Substance was either Animate or Manimate, if Animate it constituted an Embrio distinct from the Seed of the Virgin; if it was Inanimate and received a Soul by Traduction from the Virgins as our Adversaries teach, then he was the Son of the Virgin only, and in no way the Son of the Living God; which destroys this Socinian Figure.

To this Confession of *St. Peter* we add that of *St. Thomas*, where having toucht Christ, he cries out, *My Lord and my God*; now these Titles conjunctly are never given to any but the Supreme God, as it appears *Deut. 6. 3. Matth. 4. 10.* and in many other places. *Francis David*, as the *Nestorians* were wont to do, as appears by the fifth Synod, c. 12. says, That this Exclamation was not of one admiring, or affirming, as if *Thomas* on the evidence of the Resurrection, had thus said, *O Lord my God, what is it that I see? what is it that I feel with my hands?*

*hands?* as if he spake not to Christ but God: But the Text confutes this, for our Saviour bids him reach forth his hands, and feel my hands; and *Thomas* answered and said: But to whom did he answer and say, was it not to Christ who talked with him?

*Socius* against *Weike*, says he acknowledged Christ to be his God, not the most high God; but he owned him to be such a God whom he ought to worship and believe in: Did *Thomas* seign to himself a peculiar and subordinate God, whom he did not believe to be the God of *Israel*, and the most high God? without doubt he now believed that which before on the relation of the Disciples he doubted of as incredible; but he alway believed the God of *Israel* to be his God, therefore when he affirmeth this of Christ being revived, to whom he would not have given such a Title, before he did attribute to Christ what was to be attributed to the most high God; and hereby the Eternity of Christ's Divinity is manifestly proved.

Which 3ly, the profession of our Saviour himself doth assert, *I am Alpha and Omega*, saith the Lord, which is, which was, and is to come, *Revel. 1. 8.* The Lord God which is, which was, and which is to come, as the Complutenses, the Kings, *Syriack*, *Arabick*, and *Vulgar* Translations read; but he that is such must necessarily be the most high God.

*Engedinus* and *Volkelius* answer, That these are not the words of Christ, but of that God which in the first Verse is manifestly distinguished from Christ. *Ribera* and *A. Lapide* agree in this; but contrarily he speaks here, who professeth himself to be the First and the Last, *v. 17.* and in *cb. 2. v. 8.* and *cb. 22. v. 13.* But he affirms that he was dead, and now lives for ever. *Ch. 1. 18.* and is to come to Judgement. *Ch. the last, v. 13.* therefore it must necessarily be understood of Christ.

Thus the Ancients, *Athanasius*, *Nazianzen*, *Ruffinus*, *Idacius*, *Clarus*, understood it; as also the Jesuits *Alibasar* and *Alapide*, who forgot himself, or on second thoughts corrected himself on the last *cb. v. 13.* where he adds this out of *St. Ambrose*, That the ancient Christians, when Arianism prevailed, were wont to engrave *A* and *Ω* on their Tombs, to shew their detestation of that Heresie, and that they died in the Faith of him that professed himself to be the *A* and *Ω*; that is, the true and eternal God as the Father is.

2ly, We argue from three Apostolical Testimonies; the first is that of *St. John 1. 1.* In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and that Word was God. What is more clear? All agree that the Word is Christ, who being from the beginning with God, (*viz.* the Father) before the Creation, it necessarily followeth, which is expressly

preſſy affirmed; that that Word was God. Which 2ly, is farther confirmed, All things were made by him, therefore the Word was not made or created, as St. *Augustine* diſputeth. 3ly, The World in which he was, and which knew him not, was made by him, therefore he was the Creator of all things, viſible and inviſible, Col. 1. 16. Heb. 1. 2. Moreover, the Word was made Fleſh when he took the Seed of *Abraham*; And all the fulneſſ of the Godhead bodily dwelt in God manifested in the fleſh, Col. 2. 9. Therefore the Word was before the Incarnation, and before the Seed which he assumed, and therefore more ancient than his Mother, but not as a pre-exiſtent Creature, as the *Arians* confeſs againſt our Adverſaries.

Therefore, as he was the Eternal God, it is worth our time to conſider, with what wonderous Wreſtings the *Transilvanians*, do ſtretch theſe ſo plain and evident Teſtimonies, expounded and ſet in the light by the Ancients, but obſcured by the *Socinians*, eſpecially by *Smalcium* in ten Homelies on this Text, the ſum of which is this: That the word Beginning doth not note the beginning of the World, but of the Goſpel; not the firſt Creation of all things, but only the Reparation and Reformation by Chriſt. As if the Evangelift had only ſaid, according to *Smalcium* his Paraphraſe, 1. In the beginning (i. e.) of publiſhing the Goſpel, 2. was the Word, (viz.) Chriſt; this is right. 3. And that Word was with God, (i. e.) was hid, and known only to God, or obſcurely known to ſome that were near. 4. And God was the Word, or rather by force of the Article pointing at the ſubject, the Word was God, (i. e.) Man, ſo inſtrued with Divine Gifts and Vertue, that he was deſervedly worſhipped as God; for afterward when he appeared publickly all things were made by him, not ſimply all things, but ſuch only as concerned the Miniſtry of the Goſpel; theſe things were made, that is, reformed, re-created, and intirely reſtored: And without him was nothing made, (i. e.) without his Command, his Conduct and Authority; and the Word was made Fleſh, (that is) ſubjected himſelf to the Miſeries and Suffering of Fleſh.

Theſe things, if I am not deceived, will appear to wiſe Men not new only, but vain and prophane; and we may juſtly cry out to *Socinus* in the words of *Neimosevius* to *George Schormannus*, I beſeech thee in the name of God, (my Brother George) that you would judge in the fear of God, how Humane Reaſon playeth the Wanton in things Divine; and how dangerous it is, to be over-wiſe, and not to be wiſe according to Sobriety. For if this be the genuine ſence of this Text, and if this beloved Diſciple of his Lord meant nothing elſe than that his Lord in the beginning of publiſhing the Goſpel, did lay hid for a time unknown to the World, and permitted the *Baptiſt* to forerun and prepare his way, and that he came afterward and reſtored and perfected all things neceſſa-

ry for the Salvation of the Church, and subjected himself to the miseries of the Flesh; if this be all that the last of the Evangelist and the Apocalipst's hath revealed from the bosom of his Lord, he might it seems have spared his labour, without any great damage to the Truth, for all these things were clearly and more at large treated of by the preceding three Evangelists: And I would willingly learn from these quick-sighted Innovators, how it can agree with the gravity, simplicity, and fidelity of an Apostle, to promise a History, and propose Riddles, and so to involve and cloath the Matters proposed with such mystical words, as might rather send away the Hearer with Astonishment than Instruction, to invite to Secrets, when he only offers things obvious, which cannot satisfy expectation, and which might better expedite the thing in fewer words, as it was done by others.

*Lastly*, Let all wise Men judge, that are not partial, how well these Photinian Glosses do clear the Text, which says, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.* The Gloss says, *Not in the beginning, but before the beginning of publishing the Gospel, Christ was bid, known only in secret to God.* Which Fiction *Martyn Cheroqueus*, a Confident of that Party, could not digest. *2ly*, It follows in the Text, *And that Word was God.* The Gloss says, *He was but a made God; he might have said a feign'd God.* *3ly*, The Text says, *All things were made by him.* The Gloss says, *Not all things, but the things concerning the Gospel only, were not made but reformed by him.* The Text says, *The World was made by him.* The Gloss says, *Not the World which we see, but which we expect.* The Text says, *The Word was made Flesh.* The Gloss says, *The Word was not made Flesh, but only subjected to the Miseries of the Flesh.* Do not these seem to you that hear them, ingenious Glosses, which so limit the Text as to eliminate them!

Let us now weigh the second place, *Rom. 9. 5. Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for ever.* The Apostle doth here distinguish of Christ, as considered according to the Flesh, and so he descended from Jewish Ancestors, or as he is the Son of God, and so he is God over all, blessed for ever: What need was there of this restriction, (according to the Flesh) if Christ were only a meer Man? They answer with *Erasmus*, that perhaps the word God was not in the Text; being omitted by *St. Cyprian* and *Hilary*; but *Erasmus* notes that this might be omitted by the Carelessness of the Transcribers: for *Athanasius* mentions it against the *Arians*; *Ambrose* and *Theophylact* confirm it; and *Pameli*us testifies that it was in the most ancient Manuscripts: the *Socinians* have it in their German Translation, as it is reported, and *Socinus* him-



himself doth not deny, but if that word were wanting, it is supplied by what follows, *—blessed over all.* Therefore *ah,* they fly to the pointing of the words, and read the words thus, *Of whom is Christ according to the flesh born all,* here they make a Full-point, and then as a Doxology they read thus, (adding the word *fit*) *Let God be blessed for ever.* So that Christ is not here stiled God, but God who sent Christ is praised; and thus indeed the German Translation of the Socinians is pointed. *Ans.* *Marthinus Glorius* (as *Socinus* on *Aristotle's Elenchus* relates) undertook to prove from *1 John 2. 22.* that Jesus was not the Christ, but by what *Aristotle*, to wit, by thus wresting the Text, *Who is a liar (says he) but he that denieth?* here he placeth a note of Interrogation, then he proceeds, and reads rhetically, *because Jesus is not Christ.* But *Socinus* explodes him as a wicked Man; let them therefore look to it who imitate him in the same Cause, how they may avoid the same Condemnation.

The third place we urge from *Philip. 2. 6.* *Who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal to God; but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man.* Here we have a manifest difference between the form of God and the form of a Servant, and these most certain Propositions, 1. That both these Forms were united in the Person of Christ. 2. That by reason of the first he was equal to God, and by reason of the later he was like unto Men. 3. That the first Form did assume the later by emptying himself; so that his Divinity, Equality with his Father, Incarnation, Hypostatical Union, and Theanthropy, which are severally spoken of in other places, are here found joyned.

The *Transylvanians*, with *Maximinus the Arian* in *St. Augustine*, answer, That the words of the Apostle are to be read thus: *Not thinking that rapine should be made so as to equal himself with God, for so he should be injurious to God, therefore that he might not do this, he emptied himself,* (i. e.) he chose rather to be a *Servant* than an *Invader of undue Dignity.*

*Ans.* It is a most filthy addition of the word *made,* the Text says only he thought it no Robbery to be equal; or as *Tertullian* says; *Parari,* or be compared with God, where it is expressed what Christ did, not what he deliberated to do.

*Socinus* replies, by retorting the Argument, *Christ is equal to God, and hath the form of God; therefore he is not that God.*

*Ans.* Yea, therefore he is that God, for to whom the form agreeth the thing formed agreeth also; and nothing can be equal to God but God. But the word Form, he says, doth not here denote an essential but accidental Form only, nor can it consist with God so to humble himself.

*Ans.*

*Ans.* The Form of God here is to be taken in the same sense as the Form of a Servant, because there is the same reason of things opposed; but this of a Servant was true and essential, and why not the other? So that to be in the form of God, is nothing less than to be the true God, who lost nothing by humbling himself, but by assuming what he had not before, conferred many things to the Nature which he assumed. And all the Authority and Majesty which was added to the Son, was not added to him as God, but as he was the Son of Man, *John 5. 27.*

Our third Argument is drawn from the Harmony of the Old and New Testament, in which those things which in the Old Testament are attributed to the only true God of *Israel*, are in the New expounded of Christ. Out of eleven Instances that have been mentioned, three only shall suffice, the first is *Numb. 21. 5. The people spake against God and against Moses.* The Apostle in *1 Cor. 10. 9.* expounds this of Christ, *Neque let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of Serpents.*

*Socinus* objects, 1. That by *Eloim* in the Old Testament, God is not necessarily understood, but frequently an Angel, and by Christ in that place our Saviour is not necessarily understood but *Moses*.

2. It may be said that the *Israelites* tempted Christ in the Wilderness, not in his own Person which then was not, but in *Moses* his Type.

*Ans.* But *Eloim* which is here put absolutely in the six and seven Verses following, is expressly called *Jehovah*, which agrees not with Angels. And let *Socinus* shew where ever *Moses* in the Old Testament is called Christ, or where the name of Christ put absolutely, is attributed in the New Testament to any other than to our Saviour.

3<sup>d</sup>. To tempt any one before he was is said *gratia*, but thus they fall into temptation who attempt to deprive the Son of the Living God of his Deity and Eternity.

The second Instance is out of the *Psalms*, where that which is proposed of the glorious going of *Jehovah*, *Psal. 68. 19.* is expounded of Christ ascending on high, and leading Captivity Captive, *Ephes. 4. 8.*

2<sup>d</sup>. That which is ascribed to *Jehovah*, *Worship him all ye Angels,* *Psal. 97. 7.* is affirmed of Christ *Heb. 1. 6. Let all the Angels of God worship him.*

3<sup>d</sup>. That which is affirmed of the Creator of Heaven and Earth, *Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the Works of thy hands,* *Psal. 102. 26.* is attributed to Christ in the self same words, *Heb. 1. 10.*

The Adversaries are diligent to decline this either by denying that these things in the Old Testament are to be understood of the most high God, or to be repeated in the New Testament concerning Christ, or by affirming that these things may be accommodated to Christ, but not as God of the same Nature with the Father, but because he did represent the Person of the most high God.

*Ans.* Not only the words but the scope of those Texts do exclude these Evasions: That if in any manner our Saviour represented the Person of his Father in the Old Testament, it was then necessarily before he was born of the Virgin; which wholly destroys the Cause of our Adversaries.

3ly, The same is proved out of the Prophets, for that Majesty of the most High, which is so magnificently described *Isa. 6. 1.* is applied unto Christ by Name, *These things spake Esay, when he saw his glory, and spake of him, John 12. 41.* Many others of this sort may be produced.

*Socinus* objects, That these things are either spoken figuratively, or are adapted to Christ only by way of accommodation, but conclude nothing of his Eternal Deity.

*Ans.* Then those Apostles and Evangelists which urge and accommodate them to that purpose, do deal with us sophistically, or unskillfully, and are to be corrected and explained by Posterity, viz. the *Socinians*.

The fourth Argument is drawn from certain Attributes ascribed to Christ, which clearly evince that he is of the same Nature and Excellency with the Father; of very many I shall only name three, viz. Eternity in respect of Time, Omnipresence in respect of Place, and Adoration in respect of Sovereign Majesty and Dominion: Now his Eternity is asserted from these places; *The Lord hath possessed me in the beginning of his ways, from the beginning before he made any thing, Prov. 8. 22.* The *Syriack* read from Eternity; the *Arabick*, *I have begot thee before the Morning-star, Pl. 110. 2ly, His coming forth is from the days of eternity; To which, 3ly, our Saviour confirms the same of himself, Joh. 8. 58. Before Abraham was, I am.*

Here *Socinus* objects, That in the first place Wisdom signifies not the Son of God, but the Wisdom of God; nor doth this expression of the beginning of his ways, signify Eternity but Antiquity.

But this Interpretation is excluded by the following Verse, *I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning before the earth was.* The Apostle confirms our Argument, *We preach Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God, 1 Cor. 1. 4.*

To our second Argument, he cavils, That thence it would follow that Christ from Everlasting came forth from *Beibloom*. This is a shift, for the Text of the Prophet suggests a double going forth; a temporal concerning which 'tis said in the Future Tense, *He will go forth*, the fulfilling of which Prediction the Evangelists observes, *Mat. 2. 6.* And an eternal, of which it is said in the Preterperfect Tense, *His going forth was from eternity.*

To the third he trifles, that the Greek word *γεννησθαι* signifies not only to be, but to become; and hence the Vulgar reads, *Before he became, Abraham, (i. e.) a Father of Nations, I am, (i. e.) I was sent to pluck down the partition wall, to bring the Gentiles into the Church.*

*Ans.* The Question was not concerning the calling of the Gentiles, but whether Christ preceded *Abraham* so as he might see him; our Saviour affirms that he was, (*viz.*) by the glory which he had with the Father before the World began, *Joh. 17. 5.* which the *Jews* endeavoured to refute with Stones, as now the *Socinians* by Subterfuges.

Again, we assert his Omnipresence from *Joh. 3. 13.* *None hath ascended into heaven but he that came down from heaven, the Son of Man which is in heaven, where he was before, John 6. 62.* Now this he spake to *Nicodemus* while he was on Earth, and yet he declared that he was then in Heaven; therefore at the same time he was in Heaven and on Earth.

The Innovators do here betake themselves to an unheard of Comment, (*viz.*) That as *Moses* was taken up into the Mount, and *St. Paul* into the third Heavens, that they might be instructed of God, speaking to them as it were face to face; so it was more convenient that the Son should be assumed into Heaven and instructed by the Father. Which they think was done during those forty Days which intervened between his Baptism and his Conflict with Satan: this though they do not urge as an Article of Faith, yet *Smalcus* saith, *We are fully persuaded of it, and greatly rejoice that this Mystery is revealed to us by God in the Scripture.* But this Mystery, nor the Revelation of it doth please us, for what need was there that he should be taken up into Heaven for a more perfect Information, on whom the Holy Spirit did descend, and in whom the Godhead dwelt Bodily, in whom the Father was always, and he in the Father. *27.* He was amongst the wild Beasts in the Wilderness for the space of those forty Days, the Devil tempting him, and the Angels ministering unto him, as *St. Mark* expressly saith: Was the Desert Heaven, and were Satan and the Beasts admitted into it? Nor doth this Fiction satisfy the Argument, seeing we thus urge the Text, That the Son of Man whom

*Nicodemus* saw and spake to, saith expressely of himself, that he was then in Heaven; which could not be as he was a Man, therefore it must be as he was God Omnipresent. The more the Adversaries do strive in this Point, the more they intangle themselves.

*Lastly*, We infer the Deity of Christ from the Adoration which was performed unto him, for he was adored as God by *Stephen* the Proto-Martyr, calling on him, *Acts* 7. 59. *Lord Jesus receive my spirit.*

*Francis David* answereth, That that Jesus here is of the Genitive Case, and the sense is this, *O thou Lord who art the Father of Jesus*; making the Father to be the Object of Invocation, not the Son.

*Christiansus Franken* presseth the same Argument in his Disputation against *Socinus*, concerning the Adoration of Christ, where he adds, that Jesus signifieth a Saviour; but who can so save us as the Father. *Socinus* replies, That the name Jesus here is the proper name of a Person, not an Appellative of his Office, for then it should be read, *O Lord of Jesus*; which though they do confute the trifling of *Franken* in the Interpretation of this place, yet they do not answer it, by shewing how Adoration may be given to Christ whom they account to be a Creature; seeing that of *Isa.* 42. 8. saith expressely, *I am Jehovah, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another.* This Knot *Socinus* could not untie with all his skill.

*sly*, We might urge the Works of Christ: 1. The Creation, for *by him all things were made*, *Col.* 1. 16. 2. Conservation, *He sustains all things by the word of his power*, *Heb.* 1. 3. 3. He wrought Miracles in his Name and Authority. 4. He forgave Sins, *Mat.* 9. 5. He sent the Holy Ghost, *Acts* 2. Which things do exalt him above the rank of Creatures; but because the Adversaries do refer all these things to a delegated and derived Power, and not to an innate Power, which we have already proved, this may suffice.

In the last place we shall shew some Absurdities which will follow on this Heterodoxy of our Adversaries; for if Christ being of the same Nature with the Father, were not the Supreme God, it would follow, that the Scriptures do exhibit to us great Uncertainties in the great business of Salvation. 2<sup>ly</sup>, That the Churches, the Councils, the Fathers of all sorts, of all Ages, in all places, have recommended to Posterity Heretical Creeds, and monstrous Comments. 3<sup>ly</sup>, That the Martyrs have sealed ridiculous things with their Blood. 4<sup>ly</sup>, That we have given up our names in Baptism to a Creature as well as to a Creator, and Worship and Invoke a Creature with the same Religious Worship: And seeing it is acknowledged that Christ sent the Holy Ghost, which received from Christ what he delivered, *John* 16. 14. It would follow, 5<sup>ly</sup>, That a Creature did contribute something to



the Eternal Power, and made use of his Service. 6ly, From hence it may be concluded that our Mediator was insufficient for so great an Office, seeing all that he did perform was due Debt, every Creature being so subject to the Creator that it can merit nothing from him. Whence it followeth, *lastly*, That the publication of the Law was in vain, and the punishment threatned to Offenders frustrate, because it was impossible that a Finite Creature could satisfie Infinite Justice.

Therefore if our Saviour be not only the Son of Man, but also the Eternal Son of the Living God; that Lord God the  $\alpha$  and  $\omega$ , which is, which was, and is to come, the Almighty; if he were in the beginning with God; if he is God over all, blessed for ever; if he thought it no Robbery to be equal with God, and the essential Attributes of *Jehova* are every-where attributed to him; if he did by his own Power do such Works as no Creature could do, then those Blasphemies which follow on the Opinions of the Adversaries are intolerable, and we may truly and confidently conclude, Jesus Christ our Saviour to be of the same Essence and Power with the Father and Holy Spirit, which was to be demonstrated.

#### An Answer to the Objections of the Adversaries.

*Jo. Crellius* in his two Books of *One God the Father*, urgeth sixty two Objections, which we will reduce to seven Heads, under which the rest will be easily considered and confuted: *First*, He argues from exclusive Particles, that the Father only is the Supreme God: So *Job. 17. 3. This is life eternal to know thee only the true God. There is one God the Father of all, who is above all, Eph. 4. 6. To us there is one God the Father of whom are all things, 1 Cor. 8. 6. And Rom. 16. 27. To God only wise, be glory.* Hence he concludes that Christ is not the Supreme God.

1. Answer in general: These Particles do exclude only the Creatures and Idols, nor the Persons of the Son or Holy Ghost; and the Particle *only* in *S. John*, doth not limit the word *thee* but *God*, and it may be referred to the word *know*, as if it had been said, This is sufficient to eternal Life if they only know him that did send and him that was sent; or as *St. Chrysostom* reads, *This is life eternal to know thee and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, to be the only true God*; otherwise nothing is to be known concerning Christ, but that he is sent. To that in the *Corinth.* as it is attributed to the Father that he is the One God, so Christ is called the One Lord; now if because the Father is called the One God, the Son be excluded from the Deity, by the same reason, because the Son is called the One Lord, the Father may be excluded from being our Lord. The same Answer serves to that in

*Ephes.*

*Ephes. 4. and Jude 4.* as to that of *Rom. 16.* it expressly includes Christ the Wisdom of God, as the name God also includes the Trinity, where there is not a distinct mention of Persons.

2ly, They urge our Saviours own Confession, *Of that day and hour knoweth none, neither the Angels in heaven, nor the Son,* and as *St. Mark* adds, *But the Father only:* Therefore the Son is not Omniscient, and by consequence he is not the Supreme God.

*Ans.* No one knows, (*i. e.*) no Creature; for so Christ appeared and was accounted by them that questioned with him: But this doth not exclude Christ as God, nor the Holy Spirit which searcheth the deep things of God, *1 Cor. 2. 10.* Thus when it is read, *No man knoweth who the Father is but the Son;* will you therefore conclude that the Father knoweth not himself, or that the Holy Ghost knows him not? Or when you read, that *none knows the things of God, but the Spirit of God,* *1 Cor. 2. 11.* therefore the Son and the Father do not know the things of God. Men of reason should be ashamed of such an Inference. The word *alone* therefore doth not exclude all simply, but such in a certain sort whom it concerned not to know, and therefore ought to watch lest that day should come on them sleeping and unprepared. 2ly, Others add that the word (*knoweth*) doth not denote simply to know a thing, but as in the *Hebrew* Conjugation *Hephil*, to make others know; which they confirm from *1 Cor. 2. 2.* *I determined not to know any thing among you but Jesus Christ, and him crucified;* (*i. e.*) it is my Office not to teach any other thing. But I think this not so applicable, for then neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit did so know as to teach or make others to know it: But Christ as the Son of Man did not know it simply, but as the Son of God, the same God with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

3ly, They urge two Visions, the first from *Dan. 7. 13, 14.* Where one like the Son of Man came to the Ancient of Days, and received from him Glory, and Power, and a Kingdom. The second from *Rev. 5. 7.* Where the Lamb whom all confess to be Christ, received a Book from him that sat on the Throne: Where the Giver and the Receiver are really distinguished.

*Ans.* If the Son of Man in the first Vision doth denote Christ, as we acknowledge, then he did exist before he was born of the Virgin; which confutes the Adversaries. In the second the Lamb had the same Honour given him from the twenty four Elders, and from all the Creatures, as he that sat on the Throne; which argueth an Equality of Excellency; so that all these imply a distinction of Persons, not a diversity of Nature.

4ly, They urge those places wherein Christ is said to receive all things from the Father, as *Matth. 28. 18. All power is given to me in heaven and earth*, *Joh. 5. 26. The Father hath given to the Son to have Life in himself*, whence he is said to be the Image, Brightness and Character only of his Father's Person, *Heb. 1. 3.* Now it is (say they) necessary that he who receiveth, be inferior to him that giveth, and the Image or Character to its Proto-type.

*Ans. John 5. 2.* resolves all these Objections: That God gave him authority of exercising Judgment as he is the Son of Man, not of God, for so he is God of God, Light of Light, the essential Image and Character of the Person of his Father, and inferior only in Order, not in Nature or Time. But these Men will not distinguish with St. *John*, between Christ's Humane and his Divine Nature: nor with St. *Paul*, between the Form of God and the Form of a Servant; but this is their constant practice to confound the Essence and the Person.

5ly, They object, that Christ is numbred among the Creatures; being called the first born of every Creature, *Col. 1. 15.* and the beginning of the Creation, *Revel. 3. 14.* He that shall deliver up the Kingdom to God the Father, and be subject to him; therefore he cannot be of the same Nature and Excellency.

To this it is answered before, That he is called the first begotten, not the first created, for he was begotten from Eternity, before all Creatures, which were made by him, as it there followeth; he was not created in Time as the Creatures were: And if he had been so the first born, he had been before the Angels and the Virgin *Mary*, which the *Socinians* do deny against the *Arians*. 2. The Apocalipt calls him the beginning of the Creatures of God, as the Active Principle from whom all the Creatures had their beginning, not the Passive, as if he were the first of those things that were created. 3. The delivering of the Kingdom into the hands of the Father, and his subjection thereupon, is not the subjection of the Nature, but of the Economy, (after the finishing of the Mediatorial Office) or (if I may so speak) the resignation or laying down of that Office, that he might resume that Glory forever, which he affirms he had with his Father before the World was, *John 17. 5.*

6ly, They oppose this External Generation and Glory of the Son, by reasons, for upon supposition of such Generation, *Crollius* saith it would follow, 1. That the Son would be the Son of himself. 2. There would be infinite Sons. 3. That the Son would be from Eternity and not from Eternity. 4. That the Son was yet to be generated and to be generated to Eternity; which are things irrational, and not to be admitted.

*Ans.*

*Ans.* Reason doth not comprehend things Infinite, though Faith may apprehend them; therefore it is unreasonable to measure by the Rule of Reason those things which are peculiar to Faith only, and depend on Revelation only; and it is sufficiently revealed to us in the Scripture, that there is One God, and that in this Unity there are three Persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost: This we believe because it is written, and do not doubt, though it appear not by Humane reasoning how this can be; however, we deny that from the Arguings of the Adversaries, or from Reason rightly informed, it would follow, First, That according to our Opinion the Son should be the Son of himself, because one Essence doth not beget another, but one Person begets another as the Father the Son, who of him becomes another Person, not another thing. 2. It is but his Dream of infinite Sons, seeing that the only begotten is of infinite Perfection, which is not divisible or multiplicable. 3. Nor is Eternity repugnant to Generation; for *Moscorovius* against *Smigletius*, defends the probability of it, the *Materia Prima* to be eternal and uncreate and so still to remain; which yet the Leaders of this Opinion will not grant to be, and not to be from Eternity; thus supposing the Sun to be eternal, its splendor (which all would grant to have been to be, and to endure with it) must be eternal. 4. Therefore when the *Nicene* Fathers do express this eternal Generation of the Son, by the Emanation of Light from Light, they do not mean that which is fleeting from that which is fixed, but do manifest as much as they could the Equality and Co-eternity of Persons in their Order, affirming the Son to be begotten. *Genitum non generandum.*

7. *Lastly*, They load the Incarnation with so many Absurdities, as if from thence it would follow, 1. That the Father and Holy Spirit were as much incarnate as the Son. 2. That the Person of the Son did wholly cease. 3. That things in themselves different did unite. Or, 4. or at least that as *Nestorius* says, two Persons did yet subsist in the Son. But this Heap of Trifles hath been long since confuted by those of our Party.

*Hierome Zanchy*, whose words are worthy to be repeated, treating of this Controversy, saith, I affirm that I never read any thing in the Writings of *Lelius Socinus*, *Ochinus*, *Servetus*, and the rest of that *Bran*, whose Dirt is flung about by the Modern Socinians, that hath any thing of that Accuracy which many Books of the Ancient Hereticks had, for they are all either the old Song repeated an hundred times, or new Impertinencies condemned before they were conceived. Thus that Strenuous Doctor, a Person of Primitive Discipline, and of great Learning and Experience in these Controversies. To whom we may add the Acurate *Bisterfield*.

The

The Sum of all is this: We do not say, that the Essence was Incarnate, but the second Person in the Trinity. *2ly*, That he did not by this cease to be a Person, because he assumed the Humane Nature, not a Person. *3ly*, Not that by this Assumption the Divine Nature were any way perfected, but that he thereby perfected the Humane. Whence *4ly*, different Natures, as the Soul and Body in Man, did unite in one Person by an ineffable but possible Union; not making two Persons, as *Nestorius* dreamed, because they have but one Substance, which the Humane Nature that was assumed brought not with itself, but the Divine Nature assuming, did confer. And thus you have (as time gave leave) in one View, the chief Points of this large and intricate Controversie.

*To God the Father, to the Son God and Man, and to the Holy Ghost, be all Honour, Praise, and Glory, now and for ever. Amen.*

### THE CONCLUSION.

St. Hilary having vindicated the Doctrine of the Trinity, *l. 6. n. 2.* says, *Lord I believed thy words, if I am deceived, Moses, David, Solomon, and thy Apostles have deceived me; if it be a Fault to believe these, pardon me, Almighty God, for in this belief I can die; deny it I cannot: We have been baptized in this Faith; we have offered up all our Prayers in this Faith, and payed all our Thanksgivings to the Blessed Trinity; and therefore we cannot dye comfortably in any other.* And with much more confidence may the Devout Trinitarian say, as St. Hierome expresseth it, *Ecce Crucifixus meus Deus; Behold my God which was crucified for me! when he sees him coming in Judgment; than the Arian or Socinian, who proudly deny his Godhead and Satisfaction, who may too late complain in the words of St. Augustine in his Confession, l. 5. c. 9. I was going towards Hell, laden with all my Sins, while I believed not that Christ had satisfied for them.*

F I N I S.



# ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

## The Naked Gospel.

As now Published

By ARTHUR BURY, D.D.

**T**Hat this Book is now first published by the Doctor whose Name is prefixed, cannot in Justice be denied by them that have read the former; for it is quite another Book, and it may be true, though either one or the other, if not both of the former Editions of the *Naked Gospel* were published by the same Author, because they are not the same Books, yet the one which he having caused to be printed and dispersed among his Friends in several parts of the Nation, and the other wherein he made several Alterations, may be affirmed to be published by the same hand, the truth whereof needs no farther enquiry, after the *Oxford Animadversions*: That this present Copy is another Book, appears by its divers Alterations and Additions which are made; whether for the better or the worse, will appear to every judicious Reader; and that there needs no other, or severer Reflections on it, than what the Author himself hath made: He seems so to tumble in the Net which he hath woven, as to be more intangled by striving to get out. In his Preface to the Reader he confesseth, *He had not patience to be silent at such a time, when the suppression of such Opinions as he hath published, would have been greatly advantageous both to Truth and Peace.* And whether it would not have been a great degree of sauciness by a point blank Address of such a Present as the *Naked Gospel*, to direct the Venerable Body of the Convocation of the Clergy in what they had to do, is put beyond doubt by the *Oxford Convocation*: I cannot find, as he says, that it

was intended that the Convocation of the Clergy was called to make Alterations in Matters of Faith, nor that we are to weigh at the same Beam a Rite in the one, and a Doctrine in the other Scale. The Convocation I believe would have given up all their Rites and Ceremonies, rather than the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, which the Doctor on pretence of Charity, would have them to abandon.

He confesseth, *That his Book was penned with less caution than was necessary, for what was to be exposed to every vulgar eye.* But how could he imagine, that so many learned and good Men would be pleased with his questioning or denying the truth and belief of such Doctrines as they themselves believe to be necessary to salvation. He might therefore very well have spared his unbecoming Reflections on that Body.

That the Doctor was suspected to disbelieve the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, was not because he did not expressly declare his Opinion concerning them, which a true Son of the Church of England, and one that had been long before suspected as Heterodox, writing on that subject, was highly concern'd to do; but because he hath slyly and frequently insinuated divers Arguments against them; and his daubing with untemper'd Mortar in his two new Chapters of the Trinity and Incarnation, will render the matter more obscure and defaced.

As for those words in the conclusion, which he conceives some are most offended with, wherein he cannot submit to the least compliance: Let him enjoy his own Sentiments; only I cannot persuade my self, that more than his, an hundred years experience, calls on us to rack about, and steer a contrary course to what our Pilots in the greatest part of that time have steered.

As the number of those Men who are as sick of King *William*, as they were lately of King *James*, is so small, that they may be all written in a Ring: If he intends (as the current of his Discourse would carry it) such as were in the late Convocation, all which had testified by solemn Oaths, and divers of them by their learned Arguments and Exhortations, their cheerful Obedience to their present Majesties (whom God preserve as the most hopeful Defenders of our established Religion); so I heartily pray there may not be one such Prevaricator left among us, though even among the Twelve Disciples of our Saviour, there was a *Judas*; and I hope there is not one of a thousand among our Clergy that is so ill as the Doctor would represent them; such I mean, as (he says) *would wish for the cruel French, to deliver them from the present Government, or that is so unreasonably jealous,*

as to think that his present Majesty designs to make this Church, not unlike to that in which himself was educated : for which his vile suggestion, contrary to His Majesties most gracious Assurances, the Doctor is concern'd to beg His Majesty's Pardon ; and I pray God to pardon him also : It is a most invidious and malicious Quere which he adds, — *Which of the two are the truer Church of England-men, those who dread the return of King James, with his Jesuits ; or those who wish and labour for it ? Those who are so stiff as rather to hazard the whole, than to part with the least circumstance ? — And cover their stiffness to their own humours and interests with the specious pretence of zeal for the Church ?* To which I answer, That as I do not know, so if I did know any person so ill affected, I should abhor them as the Pests of the Nation.

To those of the Doctor I shall oppose these Queries, Which are the truer Church of *England-men*, those who dread the growth and success of the *Arian* and *Socinian* Heresies ; or those who adhere to the established Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation of our blessed Saviour ? Those who would erect a *Natural Religion*, a *Jewish* or *Turkish Faith*, on the Ruines of that which is truly Christian, Ancient and Catholick ? or those who live in the Communion of the Church of *England*, where this Christian Religion is established ? Every good Protestant will readily answer these Queries. And notwithstanding the Protestation of the Doctor in the close of his Epistle to the Reader, *That he is not conscious of having contradicted any of the Church's Articles in any one word* : The impartial Reader will perceive by what hath been discovered, to be the design of the **Naked Gospel** in the foregoing Exercitations, that it was mainly intended against the most important of those Articles. I only recommend to the Doctor's serious Consideration, that as it is an unaccountable Phrensie for any that abhors Popery and Slavery, to grow weary of the present Government, and to desire the return of the late King by a *French Power*, so it is the highest degree of impiety, for a Person that hath been long educated and instructed in the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, which teacheth to adore the blessed Jesus, as King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, not only to dethrone, but debase him as a meer Creature, and esteem no otherwife of him, than as a *King de Facto*, made and advanced by Imperial and Papal Edicts and Decrees, not so ancient as *Constantine*, but by *Theodosius* and *Damasus* Bishop of *Rome*. See p. 38. of the Edition in two Columns.

From what Point the Wind blew that hath caused the Doctor to steer a course contrary to what he intended at his first setting out, is

not so intelligible, as to guess at what Harbor he intends to lay up; he doth seemingly at least recant many of those Heretical Opinions which he had asserted in the first Edition of the *Stacked Gospel*, but so inconsistently, that the New Piece which he hath patcht on upon the Old Garment, will make the Rent worse. But this is no other artifice than what hath been practised by the *Arians* and *Socinians* heretofore, whose feigned Confessions and Recantations they on occasion recanted again, and their later Deeds have been worse than the former.

Chap. 7. of  
the Holy Tri-  
nity.

The D.'s first care is to give us a right notion of the usual words *word* or Substance, and *Person* or Person, which he would translate beingness and propriety. The word Substance he says, p. 45. is so much applied to matter, that some with great confidence deride it as a contradiction to say, that a Substance can be immaterial: of this Opinion were *Vorstin* and *Hobs*; and how much the Doctor differs from them, that which follows may evidence. The more we attend to our own Senses, (says the Doctor) or *Aristotle's* Predicaments, the more strongly are our Minds possess'd, that Substance must be material, &c.

As to the word Person, p. 46. he says, *Could we be as sensible that the word Person in its metaphysical height is no less improperly applied to the second Distinction in the Trinity, than the word Begotten is in its Physical baseness, and could we cast away that improper word, and use the warier word Subsistence and Propriety, we should more easily satisfy our selves, and others: Wherefore taking the word Substance for Subsistence, and Person for Propriety, he proceeds to give us a new Notion of the Trinity, such as agrees with the Doctrine of Paulus Samosatenus, and Sabellius, That the one high God is both Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. His Positions are these:*

1. *That God is a Being absolutely perfect.* 2. *That Mind is the most perfect Being.* The same with *Plato's* *Nûs*; the Original being derived from none, but Author of all, and therefore properly stiled the Father.

As Mind is the most perfect Being, so the most perfect Being must be, a perfect Mind, but an unthinking Mind cannot be a perfect one; God therefore was never unthinking; and since thought is the first and proper Issue of a thinking Mind, therefore may it most properly be stiled, *The first begotten Son and co-eternal with the Father*; because the Father was never before him, p. 48. *A thought is no less than a word conceived, and a word is no more than a thought brought forth. The Mind, or its Wisdom cannot be absolutely perfect, if they do not, or cannot perform, or want Power to act, there must there-*

fore

fore be a third Person which the Scripture calls the Holy Ghost, which is constantly described by Power and Action. This is the Doctor's *vix*, by which he thinks he hath obliged all Mankind, displayed the Mystery of the Trinity, which hath been the trouble of all Ages, and in which he hath not advanced one Proposition without warrant from the Scripture, the Church of England, the Fathers of the Church, and the best Champions for that Doctrine; and (that which is his greatest hope, is) that the Unitarians will not dissent from one of them, if taken in that sense which their terms freely offer, p. 51. And I fear it is to serve their Hypothesis, that the Doctor hath conceived and published this Notion.

It is not a little surprising, that the Doctrine which was so lately 'ridicul'd, under the term Mystery, and which must remain so 'still, a point of Push-pin Divinity. The Athanasian Doctrine fit 'to be numbred with the Roman, and would be fairly dealt with 'if left on the same level with the Arian, equally unworthy not one- 'ly of our Faith, but our Study, (see *The Naked Gospel*, printed in two Columns, p. 38.) 'A long and mischievous Controversie; 'and, Behold now the ground on which one of our Fundamental 'Articles is built; should now deserve another *Eccē* to behold (p. 49. of the Doctor's Edition) how the very Light of Nature demonstrates St. John's Mystery, *There are three that bear witness in heaven, &c.* And p. 53. How our Platonizing Doctor confutes the Atheists who accuse this Mystery as contrary to Reason, which he now saith reason in Plato discovereth; the Doctor having adapted a Natural Trinity for his Natural Religion.

But the Doctor is conscious of another Error, *viz.* That he hath Sabellionized with Sabellius, for mentioning St. Augustine's Opinion concerning the Trinity, p. 50. says, that it *favours more of Sabellianism than his, as above explained.* As the Doctor's Opinion is by him explained, it may serve as the Center wherein all the Opinions of the Ancient and Modern Hereticks may meet and acquiesce; Vm. Lirimensis asks, *Quis ante sceleratum Sabellium Unitatis Trinitatem confunderē Ausus est?* Whoever so confounded the Doctrine of the Trinity as the impious Sabellius? Of whom Sandius says, *Sabelliani tribuendo patri essentiam filio scientiam sancto vitam videntur negasse substantiam filii & sancti*, Sandius p. 120. Consonant to this our Doctor says, *The Mind is Beingness, or the Father, the Son is Wisdom, the Holy Ghost is Power and Activity.* Again Sandius p. 111. *Sabellius taught the one God in Essence and Substance to be the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, which three he called three Vertues (or Proprieties) three Names, three Persons; and for proof of this Opinion produced these Scri-*  
ptures:



tures: He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also; I and the Father are one; And I in the Father, and the Father in me. Which Scripture were commonly used by the Noetians and Samosatensians; *Patris voluit esse substantiam solidam propriam coeuv & univiam, filium autem & sanctum evipias*; (i. e.) as our Doctor renders it, Wisdom and Power to act. *Sandius* goes on, Sabellius compared the Father to the Hypostasis of the Sun, the Son to the Light and Rays, the Holy Ghost to its Calfaction; he so taught the Father, Son and Holy Ghost to be one, that they were but one *univians*; Whence his Followers, as *Sandius* observes, were called *Patropassians*, as teaching God the Father by the assumption of Humane Nature to be called the Son, and in that Nature the Father suffered, because one and the same God was Father, Son and Holy Ghost, without distinction of Persons; which, as *Lirimensis* said, was to confound the Trinity; and (as our Doctor doth) make it to consist of one Substance and two Proprieties or Energies, viz. to Think and to Act.

The Doctor says, that Thought is the first begotten Son of God, that Thought is a Word brought forth, and is the same in substance with the Mind whence it issueth; but if it issueth from the Mind, it becomes separate, and cannot be any longer the same with the Mind. And this Opinion is the same which *Philastrius* notes to be the Opinion of *Paulus* of *Samosata*; That the Word was not the substantial Son of God, co-eternal with the Father, but the *Verbum inepigenor*, the enunciative or prolative Word, only an aery Sound, not a living and sempeternal Person, co-equal with the Father. An Opinion somewhat like that of Mr. *Hobbs* concerning the Trinity, which he makes God the Father speaking by *Moses* in the Old Testament, and by Christ in the New.

*Sandius* observes the like of *Cosmas*, who taught with *Sabellius*, That the Word of God was naked and without any subsistence; which his Followers called *Verbum vocale & enunciativum*, and sometime internal or mental, p. 117. And he tells us, that though the Modern Socinians detest the Error of *Sabellius*, yet they are ignorantly guilty of it, p. 120. Near of kin are the Doctor's new Notions of the second Person in the Holy Trinity, to the old Heresies so often condemned, making the second Person a Thought, the third a Power; and he might have named as many more of the Divine Propriety, (viz.) Holiness, Love, Justice, &c. as would have made a Denary of Persons.

The Doctor describes the third Person in the Trinity by Power and Action, and this description he says is constantly used in the Holy Scripture. Though we find the Attribute of *Holy* more frequently

quently annexed to that of the Spirit, as *Eph. 4. 30. Grieved not the holy Spirit*, *Eph. 1. 13.* and the Holy Ghost in almost an hundred places.

We find also that of Power attributed to the second Person more eminently than to the third, as *1 Cor. 1. 24. Christ is called the power of God, and the wisdom of God.* *Matth. 28. 18. All power is given to me in heaven and earth.* *Hebr. 1. 3. He upholds all things by the word of his power.* *Matth. 9. 6. The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins.* And he that made and upholds, and shall judge all Men, may most properly be called the power of God. How vain then is that boast of the Doctor's, *p. 49. That this his way of tracing the Holy Trinity, agrees to a syllable with the words of the Holy Scripture, and the Church of England, and is more plain to be understood and proved, than that magisterial way vulgarly used, wherein Reason is not permitted to speak*, *p. 50.* This is *Platonis fastum Majore fastu*; to oppose his private Reason against both the Reason and Authority of that Church whereof he professeth himself a Son, and impose on it an old Herefie in a new Dress. *Bellar. in Cronol.* says, That *Fr. David* held the Son and Holy Spirit to be *Vir- tutes Dei non distinctas a Patre, persona relatione vel essentia.*

*Chap. 8. p. 53.* Treateth of the Incarnation: The Doctor entitled *Chap. 7.* of the first Edition, thus: *Of Belief with meer respect to the Person of Christ: Inquisitiveness concerning his Incarnation censured, first, because Impertinent.*

And he endeavours to prove it impertinent to our Lord's design, (*viz.*) That we should enquire after the Dignity of his Person, that he was the Eternal Son of God; this he calls Boys play, and Push-pin, and quotes the Judgment of *Constantine* for it: *When the Game* (as he calls it) *was first set on foot.* Then *p. 29.* of the first Edition, *It was no more necessary to understand the Dignity of the Person (of Christ) than for a Traveller to understand the Features of the Sun.* Now *p. 55.* of the new Edition, *If we regard the Dignity of the Person, it is plainly more honourable to believe him God the Creator, than a Creature Desired.* Then *p. 30.* (he says,) *That part of Mankind which our Lord most favoureth, are most unable to pay him such a belief.* Now *p. 54.* *If we consider the thing it self, it appears much more credible that the Eternal Son of God should descend to the Nature of Man, than that a Man should be made God, endued with a new Omniscience to hear, and Omnipotence to grant the Prayers of all Supplicants: Then it was fruitless to the Enquirer's satisfaction,* *p. 31.* Now *p. 55.* *If we consider the fruits, our thankfulness must be greater, our love more inflamed, our obedience more quickened, our hatred to sin more sharpened, and all the good ends of Faith much more promoted: Then it was dangerous lest we should blasphem,*

blaspheme, p. 36. and because we have no firm ground to go upon. Now p. 55. Upon all accounts were the Scriptures so doubtful as to leave us to our choice, we ought rather to carry our bias toward our Lord's eternal Divinity, than against it.

In this and what other Disputes may arise (for I have not leisure to enquire what other Additions or Alterations are made). I doubt not but the Rector of Exeter-Colledge will sufficiently answer the private Opinions of Dr. A. B.

In the mean time I am very glad to hear, and heartily congratulate the Doctor for what he hath declared, p. 53. *That though there be in the Trinity a great Mystery, yet now nothing is more plain than that of St. John, The word became flesh, and dwelt among us : or those words of St. Paul, Great is the Mystery of Godliness ; God was manifested in the flesh : And that these and several other words of Scripture, so plainly speak our Lord's Divinity, that whoever otherwise interprets them, will no less rob the words of their meaning, than Christ of his honour ; And what is there in this wonderful Mystery that Reason cannot comprehend,* p. 54.

And I hope he will make his Notion more intelligible, how a Thought, which he calls the first-begotten Son of God, may also be called the only begotten Son of God ? And how a Thought or Word mental or declared, could intimately, vitally, and perfectly unite itself to a divinely begotten Child, which whatever he says to the contrary, is much more obscure than what the Scripture, and the Church of England have said.

When he says, p. 54. *He can see no great reason why Socinus who contended for the Worship of Christ, should also contend against his Eternity.* I should think he means he sees no reason for it at all : and seeing he hath so much Charity for those that altogether deny our Saviour's Deity, and dare not worship or invoke him at all, as not to deny them the Name of Christians, or hope of Salvation, I beseech him to extend a more affectionate and real love and good will to all such as heartily profess to believe the one, and sincerely devote themselves to the practice of the other. But this seeming Reproof of Socinus for his Opinion concerning the Divinity of Christ, is no more than that for which David Franken, and others that agreed with Socinus to deny his eternal Deity, did more severely reprimand him for, (*viz.*) for worshipping him whom he affirmed to be but a Creature, contrary to the Scripture. To confute and silence this new Notion of the Doctor, and to shew how much more intelligible and rational the Doctrine of the Eternal Generation of the Son of God, as professed in the Church of England, is, I shall inform the Reader of that de-

demonstrative Explanation of it, which the learned Dr. *Pearson*; Bishop of *Chester* hath elaborated.

Dr. *Pearson* on the *Creed*, p. 267. Printed 1659. The third assertion to be demonstrated is, That the Divine Essence which Christ had, as the *Word*, before he was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*, he had not of himself, but by communication from God the Father; for this cannot be denied, That there can be but one Essence properly Divine, and so but one God of infinite Wisdom, Power, and Majesty, that there can be but one Person originally of himself subsisting in that infinite Being, because a Plurality of more Persons so subsisting would necessarily infer a multiplicity of Gods. — Wherefore it necessarily followeth, that Jesus Christ, who is certainly not the Father, cannot be a Person subsisting in the Divine Nature originally of himself, and consequently being we have already proved that he is truly and properly the Eternal God, he must be understood to have the Godhead communicated to him from the Father. All things whatever the Father hath are mine, saith Christ, *John* 16. 15. Because in him is the sameness of the Godhead, and more than that the Father cannot have, p. 269. Being the Divine Nature, as it is absolutely immaterial and incorporeal, is also indivisible: Christ cannot have any part of it only communicated to him, but the whole, by which he must be acknowledged co-essential of the same Substance with the Father, as the Council of *Nice* determined, and the Fathers before them taught. Hence Christ says, *I and the Father are one*, *Joh.* 10. 30. which raised a second motion in the Jews to stone him; and though Christ saith, *The Father is in me, and I in him*; yet withal he saith, *I came out from the Father*; by the former shewing the Divinity of his Essence, by the later the Origination of himself. We must not look on the Divine Nature as sterile, but rather acknowledge and admire the secondity and communicability of itself, upon which the Creation of the World dependeth, God making all things by his Word, to whom he first communicated that Omnipotency which is the cause of all things.

The fourth assertion followeth, which is, That the communication of the Divine Essence by the Father, is the Generation of the Son, and Christ who was eternally God, not of himself, but from the Father, is the Eternal Son of God. That God alway had a Son appears by *Agur's* Question: *Who hath established all the ends of the Earth? What is his Name? And what is his Son's Name, if thou canst tell?* And it was the chief design of *Masbomer* to deny this truth, because he knew it was not otherwise possible to prefer himself before our Saviour, wherefore he frequently inculcates that Blasphemy

in his *Alchoran*, that God hath no such Son nor any equal with him, and his Disciples have corrupted the Psalm of *David*, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*; into, *Thou art my Prophet*, I have educated thee. — But by the consent of the ancient Jews, and the interpretation of the blessed Apostles, we know these words belong to Christ, and in the most proper sense to him alone. — Now that the communication of the Divine Essence by the Father, was the true and proper Generation by which he hath begotten the Son, will thus appear, because the most proper Generation which we know, is nothing else but a vital production of another in the same Nature, with a full representation of him from whom he is produced: Thus Man begetteth a Son, that is, produceth another Man of the same humane Nature with himself, and this production as a perfect Generation, becomes the foundation of the relation of Paternity in him that produceth, and of Filiation in him that is produced. This is the known Confession of all Men, That a Son is nothing but another produced by his Father, in the same Nature with him. — The similitude in which the Propriety of Generation is preserved, is that which consists in identity of Nature, and this communication of the Divine Essence by the Father to the Word, is evidently a sufficient foundation of such a similitude, from whence Christ is called, *The Image of God*; *the brightness of his Glory*, *the express Image of his Person*.

Then he proceeds to shew, That this communication of the Divine Essence is a more proper Generation than any Generation of the Creatures, not only because it is in a more perfect manner, but also because the identity of Nature is most perfect. As in the Divine Essence we acknowledge all the Perfections of the Creature, subtracting all the Imperfections which adhere to them in things below; so in communication we must look upon the reality without any kind of defect, blemish, or impurity. In humane Generation the Son is begotten in the same Nature with the Father, which is performed by derivation or decision of part of the Substance of the Parent, but this decision includeth imperfection, because it supposeth the Substance divisible, and consequently corporeal, whereas the Essence of God is incorporeal, spiritual, and indivisible, and therefore his Nature is really communicated not by derivation or decision, but by a total and plenary communication.

In natural Generation the Father necessarily precedeth the Son, and begets one younger than himself; for seeing Generation is for the perpetuity of the Species, where the individuals successively fail, it is sufficient if the Father can produce another to live after him,  
and



and continue the existence of his Nature when his Person is dissolved; but this supposeth the imperfection of Mortality wholly to be removed, when we speak of Him who inhabiteth Eternity, the Essence which God alway had without beginning; without beginning he did communicate, being alway Father as alway God. Animals when they come to perfection of Nature then become prolific; in God eternal Perfection shews his eternal Fecundity: And that which is most remarkable, in Humane Generations the Son is of the same nature with the Father, and yet is not the same Man, because though he have an Essence of the same kind, yet he hath not the same Essence, the power of Generation depending on the first prolifical benediction; increase and multiply it must be made by way of Multiplication, and thus every Son becomes another Man: but the Divine Essence being by reason of its simplicity not subject to division, and in respect of its infinity incapable of multiplication, is so communicated as not to be multiplied, insomuch, that he which proceedeth by that communication, hath not only the same Nature, but is the same God, the Father God and the Word God; *Abraham* Man and *Isaac* Man, but *Abraham* one Man *Isaac* another Man, not so the Father one God and the Son another God, but the Father and the Word both the same God. Being then the propriety of Generation is founded in the essential Similitude of the Son to the Father by reason of the same Nature which he receiveth from him, being the full perfect Nature of God is communicated to the Word, and that more intimately, and with a greater Unity and Identity than can be found in Humane Generations, it follows that this communication of the Divine Nature is the proper Generation by which Christ is, and is called the true and proper Son of God; this was the foundation of *St. Peter's* Confession, *Thou art Christ the Son of the living God.* This the ground of our Saviour's distinction, *I go to my Father, and to your Father.* Hence did *St. John* raise a Verity more than only a Negation of Falsity, when he said, *We are in the true Son, for we which are in him are true not false sons, but such sons we are not as the true Son.* Hence did *St. Paul* draw an Argument of the infinite Love of God towards Man, in that he spared not his own proper Son.

*Multum distat inter dominationem & conditionem inter generationem & adoptionem, inter substantiam & gratiam ideoque non hic permixte, nec passim dicitur; ascendo ad patrem nostrum, aut deum nostrum, sed ad patrem meum, & patrem vestrum, ad deum meum, & ad deum vestrum: Aliter enim deus illi pater est aliter nobis illum, siquidem natura coæquat miseri-*

*miseriordia humilitas, nos vero natura profrenat misericordia erga.* Ca-  
preolus Carthag. Epist.

Thus (saith this incomparable Author) we have sufficiently shew-  
ed that the eternal Communication of the Divine Essence by the  
Father to the Word, was the proper Generation, by which Christ  
Jesus always was the true and proper Son of God, which was our  
fourth Assertion.

And now I may hope that the Doctor will be as big as his word,  
not to rise up any more against the Doctrine and Authority of the  
Church, (whereof he styles himself a true Son) and in which he ac-  
knowledgeth a Power to impose Silence, though not Faith. To  
the Reader, p. 7.

## F I N I S.

## ERRATA

PAGE 20. l. ult. read *ambili* c. 16. p. 22. after ground of add. denyng. p. 27. r. III. p.  
39. l. 16. for *contra* r. *colu*. and l. 21. for *nosce* miss. p. 38. l. 15. for *de* n. *de* *clara*.  
p. 49. l. add *is to the word Religion*. p. 56. l. 3. r. *opposit*, and l. 20. *proferit*. p. 77. l. 16.  
dele *est*, and l. ult. for *which* r. *whar*. p. 61. l. 16. *Amman* (i. e.) p. 65. l. 11. for *Eastern*  
r. *Western*. p. 66. l. 1. for *Valente* r. *Valens*. p. 69. l. 3. r. *seniore* de *filio*. p. 70. l. 2. dele  
*either Imperial* or. p. 80. l. 6. r. *proferre*. p. 84. l. 27. r. *denied* for *denied*. p. 87. l. 33.  
by *communion* interpretation. p. 95. l. 13. after *Doctrinas* add *Thom*. p. 96. l. 20. *Galorum*.  
p. 106. l. penult. add *is before christ*. p. 119. l. 1. *Præstabil*. p. 130. l. 14. add *by before the*  
*word Father*. p. 154. l. 36. a. *eternal* for *external*.